arXiv:1609.03938v1 [cs.GT] 13 Sep 2016

Envy-Free Cake-Cutting in Two Dimensions [1]

Erel Segal-Halevi[2], Shmuel Nitzan[3], Avinatan Hassidim[4] and Yonatan Aumann[5]

Abstract

We consider the problem of fairly dividing a two-dimensional heterogeneous resource among several agents with different preferences. Potential applications include dividing land-estates among heirs, museum space among presenters or space in print and electronic media among advertisers. Classic cake-cutting procedures either consider a one-dimensional resource, or allocate each agent a collection of disconnected pieces. In practice, however, the two-dimensional shape of the allotted piece is of crucial importance in many applications. For example, when building houses or designing advertisements, in order to be useful, the allotments should be squares or rectangles with bounded aspect-ratio. We thus introduce the problem of fair two-dimensional division wherein the allocated piece must have a pre-specified geometric shape. We present constructive cake-cutting procedures that satisfy the two most prominent fairness criteria, namely *envy-freeness* and *proportionality*. In scenarios where proportionality cannot be achieved due to the geometric constraints, our procedures provide a *partially-proportional* division, guaranteeing that the fraction allocated to each agent be at least a certain positive constant. We prove that in many natural scenarios the envy-freeness requirement is compatible with the best attainable partial-proportionality. **JEL classification**: D63

Keywords: Cake Cutting, Envy Free, Two Dimensional Cake, Land Division, Geometry, Fairness

1. Introduction

Fair cake-cutting is an active field of research with various applications. A prominent application is division of land (e.g. Berliant and Raa [8], Berliant et al. [9], Legut et al. [28], Chambers [14], Dall'Aglio and Maccheroni [17], Hüsseinov [22], Nicolò et al. [33]). The basic setting considers a heterogeneous good, such as a land-estate, to be divided among several agents. The agents may have different preferences over the possible pieces of the good, e.g. one agent prefers the forests while the other prefers the sea shore. The goal is to divide the good among the agents in a way deemed "fair". The common fairness criterion in economics is *Envy-freeness*, which means that no agent prefers getting a piece allotted to another agent.

Envy-freeness on its own is trivially satisfied by the empty allocation. The task becomes more interesting when envy-freeness is combined with an *efficiency* criterion. The most common such criterion is Pareto efficiency. Indeed, Weller [48] has proved that, when the agents' preferences

[1] A preliminary version of this paper appeared in the proceedings of AAAI 2015 [40]. The main additions in the present version are: (a) handling multi-dimensional cakes of arbitrary shape rather than just rectangles, (b) handling an arbitrary number n of agents rather than just 2 or 3.

[2] erelsgl@cs.biu.ac.il . Corresponding author.

[3] nitzans@biu.ac.il

[4] avinatan.hassidim@biu.ac.il

[5] aumann@cs.biu.ac.il



Figure 1: A square land-estate has to be divided between two people. The land-estate is mostly barren, except for three water-pools (discs). The agents have the same preferences: each agent wants a square land-plot with as much water as possible. The squares must not overlap. Hence:
(a) It is impossible to give both agents more than 1/3 of the water. Hence:
(b) An envy-free division must give each agent at most 1/3 of the water.
(c) But such a division cannot be Pareto-efficient since it is dominated by a division which gives one agent 1/3 and the other 2/3 of the water.

are represented by non-atomic measures, there always exists a competitive-equilibrium with equal-incomes, and the equilibrium allocation is both Pareto-efficient and envy-free. However, Weller's equilibrium allocation gives no guarantees about the *geometric shape* of the allotted pieces. A "piece" in his allocation might even be a union of a countable number of disconnected cake-bits. So, Weller's positive result is valid only when the agents' preferences ignore the geometry of their allotted pieces. While such preferences may make sense when dividing an actual edible cake, they are not so sensible when dividing land.

Many authors have noted the importance of imposing some geometric constraints on the pieces. The most common constraint is *connectivity* — each agent should receive a single connected piece rather than a possibly infinite collection thereof. The cake is usually assumed to be the one-dimensional interval $[0, 1]$ and the allotted pieces are sub-intervals (e.g. Stromquist [43], Su [45], Nicolò and Yu [34], Azrieli and Shmaya [3]). This is usually justified by the reasoning that higher dimensional settings can always be projected onto one dimension, and hence fairness in one dimension implies fairness in higher dimensions. However, projecting back from the one dimension, the resulting two-dimensional plots are thin rectangular slivers, of little use in most practical applications; it is hard to build a house on a $10 \times 1,000$ meter plot even though its area is a full hectare, and a thin 0.1-inch wide advertisement space would ill-serve most advertises regardless of its height.

Berliant and Dunz [7] have studied a multi-dimensional cake model. Their results are mostly negative: when general value measures are combined with geometric preferences, a competitive-equilibrium might not exist. In fact, even regardless of competitive-equilibrium, a Pareto-efficient-envy-free allocation might not exist, as we show in Figure 1.

Thus, to get an envy-free allocation among agents with geometric preferences, we must replace Pareto-efficiency with a different efficiency criterion. A natural candidate is *proportionality* — every agent should receive at least $1/n$ of the total cake value. This was the first fairness criterion studied in the context of cake-cutting [42] and it is still very common in the cake-cutting literature [37, 35]. Since with geometric preferences, a proportional division does not always exist (see Figure 1), we relax the proportionality requirement and consider *partial proportionality*. Partial proportionality means that each agent receives a piece worth at least a fraction p of the total cake-value, where p is a positive constant, $0 < p \leq 1/n$. Obviously we would like p to be as large as possible. In a

previous paper [41], we showed that partial-proportionality can be attained in various geometric settings. For example, in the setting of Figure 1 (square cake and two agents who want square pieces), each agent can be guaranteed at least a fraction 1/4 of the total cake-value, and this is the largest fraction that can be guaranteed. However, these results did not consider envy. This raises the following question, which is at the heart of the present paper:

> When each agent wants a piece with a given geometric shape, what is the largest fraction of the cake-value that can be guaranteed to every agent in an envy-free allocation?

The following example shows that existing cake-cutting procedures are insufficient for answering this question.

Example 1.1. You and a partner are going to divide a square land-estate. It is 100-by-100 square meters and its western side is adjacent to the sea. Your desire is to build a house near the seashore. You decide to use the classic procedure for envy-free division: "You cut, I choose". You let your partner divide the land to two plots, knowing that you have the right to choose the plot that is more valuable according to your personal preferences. Your partner makes a cut parallel to the shoreline at a distance of only 1 meter from the sea. [6] Which of the two plots would you choose? The western plot contains a lot of sea shore, but it is so narrow that it has no room for building anything. On the other hand, the eastern plot is large but does not contain any shore land. Whichever plot you choose, the division is not proportional for you, because your utility is far less than half the utility of the original land estate.

Of course the cake *could* be cut in a more sensible way (e.g. by a line perpendicular to the sea), but the current division procedures say nothing about how exactly the cake should be cut in each situation in order to guarantee that the division is fair in a way that respects the geometric preferences. While the cut-and-choose procedure still guarantees envy-freeness, it does not guarantee partial-proportionality since it does not guarantee any positive utility to agents who want square pieces. □

This paper presents cake-cutting procedures that guarantee both envy-freeness and partial-proportionality. Our procedures focus on agents who want *fat pieces* — pieces with a bounded length/width ratio, such as squares. The rationale is that a fat shape is more convenient to work with, build on, cultivate, etc.

1.1. Fatness

We use the following formal definition of fatness, which is adapted from the computational geometry literature, e.g. Agarwal et al. [1], Katz [26]:

Definition 1.2. Let $R \geq 1$ be a real number. A d-dimensional piece is called *R-fat*, if it contains a d-dimensional cube B^- and is contained in a parallel d-dimensional cube B^+, such that the ratio between the side-lengths of the cubes is at most R: $\text{len}(B^+)/\text{len}(B^-) \leq R$.

A 2-dimensional cube is a square. So, for example, the only 2-dimensional 1-fat shape is a square (it is also 2-fat, 3-fat etc.). An $L \times 1$ rectangle is L-fat; a right-angled isosceles triangle is 2-fat (but not 1-fat) and a circle is $\sqrt{2}$-fat (see Figure 2).

[6] The reason why he decided to cut this way is irrelevant since a fair division procedure is expected to guarantee that the division is fair for every agent playing by the rules, regardless of what the other agents do.



Figure 2: Fatness of several 2-dimensional geometric shapes. The dashed square is the largest contained cube; the dotted square is the smallest containing parallel cube. The shape is R-fat if the ratio of the side-lengths of these squares is at most R.

Note that the fatness requirement is inherently multi-dimensional and cannot be reduced to a 1-dimensional requirement. Hence it cannot be satisfied by methods developed for a 1-dimensional cake.[7]

1.2. Results

We prove that envy-freeness and partial-proportionality are *compatible* in progressively more general geometric scenarios. Our proofs are constructive: in every geometric scenario (geometric shape of the cake and preferred shape of the pieces), we present a procedure that divides the cake with the following guarantees:

- *Envy-freeness*: every agent weakly prefers his/her allotted piece over the piece given to any other agent.
- *Partial-proportionality*: every agent receives a piece worth for him at least a fraction p of his total cake-value, where p is a positive constant that depends on the geometric requirements.

In the following theorems, the partial-proportionality guarantee p is given in parentheses.

Theorem 1. *When dividing a cake to two agents, there is a procedure for finding an envy-free and partially-proportional allocation in the following cases:*
(a) The cake is square and the usable pieces are squares ($p \geq 1/4$).
(b) The cake is an R-fat rectangle and the usable pieces are R-fat rectangles, where $R \geq 2$ ($p \geq 1/3$).
(c) The cake is an arbitrary R-fat object and the pieces are $2R$-fat, where $R \geq 1$ ($p \geq 1/2$).

Value-shape trade-off: Theorem 1 illustrates a multiple-way trade-off between value and shape. Consider two agents who want to divide a square land-estate with no envy. They have the following options:

- By projecting a 1-dimensional division obtained by any classic cake-cutting procedure, they can achieve a proportional allocation (a value of at least 1/2) with rectangular pieces but with no bound on the aspect ratio — the pieces might be arbitrarily thin.

[7] In contrast, the simpler requirement that the pieces be rectangles with an arbitrary length/width ratio can easily be reduced to a 1-dimensional requirement that the pieces are connected intervals. Such reduction is also possible for the requirements that the pieces be simplexes [24] or polytopes [17] with an unbounded aspect ratio.

- By (a), they can achieve an allocation with square pieces but only partial proportionality — the proportionality might be as low as 1/4.
- By (b), they can achieve a proportionality of 1/3 with 2-fat rectangles, which is a compromise between the previous two options.
- By (c), they can achieve an allocation that is *both* proportional *and* with 2-fat pieces, but the pieces might be non rectangular.

The proportionality constants in Theorem 1 are tight in the following sense: it is not possible to guarantee an allocation with a larger proportionality, even if envy is allowed. This means that envy-freeness is compatible with the largest possible proportionality — we don't have to compromise on proportionality to prevent envy.

Our second theorem extends these results to any number of agents.

Theorem 2. *When dividing a cake to n agents, there is a procedure for finding an envy-free and partially-proportional allocation in the following cases:*

(a) The cake is square and the usable pieces are squares ($p \geq 1/(4n^2)$).

(b) The cake is an R-fat rectangle and the usable pieces are R-fat rectangles, where $R \geq 1$ ($p \geq 1/(4n^2)$).

(c) The cake is a d-dimensional R-fat object and the pieces are $\lceil n^{1/d} \rceil R$-fat,[8] *where $d \geq 2$ and $R \geq 1$ ($p \geq 1/n$).*

Value-shape trade-off: Part (a) and part (c) are duals in the following sense:

- Part (a) guarantees an envy-free division with perfect pieces (squares) but compromises on the proportionality level;
- Part (c) guarantees an envy-free division with perfect proportionality ($1/n$) but compromises on the fatness of the pieces.

The "magnitude" of the first compromise is $4n$, since the proportionality drops from $1/n$ to $1/(4n^2)$. We do not know if this magnitude is tight: we know that it is possible to attain a division with square pieces and a proportionality of $1/O(n)$ which is not necessarily envy-free [41], but we do not know if a proportionality of $1/O(n)$ is compatible with envy-freeness.

The "magnitude" of the second compromise is $\lceil n^{1/d} \rceil$. This magnitude is asymptotically tight. We prove that, in order to guarantee a proportional division of an R-fat cake, with or without envy, we must allow the pieces to be $\Omega(n^{1/d})R$-fat.

1.3. Challenges and solutions

The main challenge in two-dimensional cake-cutting is that utility functions that depend on geometric shape are not *additive*. For example, consider an agent who wants to build a square house the utility of which is determined by its area. The utility of this agent from a 20×20 plot is 400, but if this plot is divided to two 20×10 plots, the utility from each plot is 100 and the sum of utilities is only 200. Most existing procedures for proportional cake-cutting assume that the valuations are additive, so they are not applicable in our case. While there are some previous works on cake-cutting with non-additive utilities, they too cannot handle geometric constraints:

[8] $\lceil x \rceil$ denotes the *ceiling* of x — the smallest integer which is larger than x.

- Berliant et al. [9], Maccheroni and Marinacci [30] focus on sub-additive, or concave, utility functions, in which the sum of the utilities of the parts is *more* than the utility of the whole. These utility functions are inapplicable in our scenario because, as illustrated in the previous paragraph, utility functions that consider geometry are not necessarily sub-additive — the sum of the utilities of the parts might be less than the utility of the whole.

- Dall'Aglio and Maccheroni [17] do not explicitly require sub-additivity, but they require *preference for concentration*: if an agent is indifferent between two pieces X and Y, then he prefers 100% of X to 50% of X plus 50% of Y. This axiom may be incompatible with geometric constraints: the agent in the above example is indifferent between the two 20×10 rectangles, but he prefers 50% of their union (the 20×20 square) to 100% of a single rectangle.[9]

- Sagara and Vlach [39], Hüsseinov and Sagara [23] consider general non-additive utility functions but provide only non-constructive existence proofs.

- Su [45], Caragiannis et al. [13], Mirchandani [32] provide practical division procedures for non-additive utilities, but they crucially assume that the cake is a 1-dimensional interval and cannot handle two-dimensional constraints.

When envy-free division protocols are applied to agents with non-additive utility functions, the division is still envy-free, but the utility per agent might be arbitrarily small. This is true for cut-and-choose (as shown in Example 1.1 above) and it is also true for all other procedures for envy-free division that we are aware of (Stromquist [43], Brams and Taylor [11], Reijnierse and Potters [36], Su [45], Barbanel and Brams [4], Manabe and Okamoto [31], Cohler et al. [16], Deng et al. [18], Kurokawa et al. [27], Chen et al. [15], Aziz and Mackenzie [2]).

Our way to cope with this challenge is to explicitly handle the geometric constraints in the procedures. The main tool we use is the *geometric knife function*.

Moving-knife procedures have been used for envy-free cake-cutting since its earliest years [19, 43, 12, 38]. For example, consider the following simple procedure for envy-free division among two agents. A referee moves a knife slowly over the cake, from left to right. Whenever an agent feels that the piece to the left of the knife is worth for him exactly half the total cake value, he shouts "stop!". Then, the cake is cut at the current knife location, the shouter receives the piece to its left and the non-shouter receives the piece to its right.

In this paper we formalize the notion of a knife and add geometric constraints guaranteeing that the final pieces have both the desired geometric shape and a sufficiently high value.

1.4. Related work

The prominent model in the cake-cutting literature assumes that the cake is an interval. Several authors diverge from the interval model by assuming a circular cake (e.g. Thomson [46], Brams et al. [10], Barbanel et al. [5]), but they still work in one dimension so the pieces are one-dimensional arcs corresponding to thin wedge-like slivers.

The importance of the multi-dimensional geometric shape of the plots was noted by several authors.

Hill [21], Beck [6], Webb [47], Berliant et al. [9] study the problem of dividing a disputed territory between several bordering countries, with the constraint that each country should get a piece that is adjacent to its border.

[9] We are grateful to Marco Dall'Aglio for his help in clarifying this issue.

Ichiishi and Idzik [24], Dall'Aglio and Maccheroni [17] require the plots to be convex shapes such as multi-dimensional simplexes. However, there are no restrictions on the allocated simplexes and apparently these can be arbitrarily thin. Additionally, the proofs are purely existential.

Iyer and Huhns [25] describe a procedure for giving each agent a rectangular plot with an aspect ratio determined by the agent. Their procedure asks each of the n agents to draw n disjoint rectangles on the map of the two-dimensional cake. These rectangles are supposed to represent the "desired areas" of the agent. The procedure tries to give each agent one of his n desired areas. However, it does not succeed unless each rectangle proposed by an individual intersects at most one other rectangle drawn by any other agent. If even a single rectangle of Alice intersects two rectangles of George (for example), then the procedure fails and no agent gets any piece.

In a related paper [41] we considered the problem of partially-proportional division when the pieces must be squares or fat rectangles. We presented a procedure for dividing a square cake among n agents such that each agent receives a square piece with a value of at least $1/(4n-4)$. When all agents have the same value function, the proportionality improves to $1/(2n)$. We also proved that the upper bound in both cases is $1/(2n)$. The procedures in the present paper use very different techniques, which guarantee envy-freeness in addition to partial-proportionality. Their down-side is that their proportionality guarantee (in the case of square pieces) is only $1/(4n^2)$. Additionally, in the present paper we handle general fat objects rather than just squares and rectangles. Some of the upper bounds on partial-proportionality are replicated from that paper to make the current paper stand alone (Appendix B). Each of the two papers can be fully understood without reading the other one.

1.5. Paper structure

The paper proceeds as follows. The formal definitions and model are provided in Section 2. Section 3 introduces the core geometric concepts and techniques. These geometric techniques are then applied in the construction of the envy-free division procedures for two agents (Section 4) and n agents (Section 5). Some directions for future work are presented in Section 6.

2. Model and Terminology

The *cake* C is a Borel subset of a Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^d$. In most of the paper $d = 2$. *Pieces* are Borel subsets of $\mathbb{R}^d$. *Pieces of* C are Borel subsets of C.

There is a family S of pieces that are considered usable. An *S-piece* is an element of S.

There are $n \geq 1$ *agents*. Each agent $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$ has a value-density function v_i, which is an integrable, non-negative and bounded function on C. In the context of land division, the value-density function represents the quality of each land-spot in the eyes of the agent. It may depend upon factors such as the fertility of soil, the probability of finding oil, the existence of trees, etc.

The *value* of a piece X to agent i is marked by $V_i(X)$ and it is the integral of the value-density:

$$V_i(X) = \int_{x \in X} v_i(x) dx$$

We assume that for all agents i, $V_i(C) < \infty$. Hence each V_i is a finite measure and it is absolutely-continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure on C.

In the standard cake-cutting model [48, 14, 29, 15], the *utility function* of an agent is identical to his/her value measure. The present paper diverges from this model by considering agents whose utility functions depend both on value and on geometric shape. We assume that an agent can derive utility only from an S-piece; when his allotted land-plot is not an S-piece, he selects the

most valuable S-piece contained therein and utilizes it. For each agent i, we define the *S-value function*, which assigns to each piece X the value of the most valuable usable piece contained therein:

$$V_i^S(X) = \sup_{s \in S \ , \ s \subseteq X} V_i(s)$$

We assume that the utility of agent i is equal to his S-value function V_i^S. In general, V_i^S is not a measure since it is not additive (it is not even sub-additive). Hence, cake-cutting procedures that require additivity are not applicable. Note that the two most common cake-cutting models are special cases of our model:

- The model in which each agent may receive an arbitrary Borel subset [48] is a special case in which S is the set of all Borel subsets of C.
- The model in which each agent must receive a connected piece [43] is a special case in which C is an interval and S is the set of intervals.

When the utilities of all agents are determined by S-value functions, we can restrict our attention to allocations in which each agent receives an S-piece. An *S-allocation* is a vector of n S-pieces $X = (X_1, ..., X_n)$, one piece per agent, such that the X_i are pairwise-disjoint and their union is contained in C. We express the latter two facts succinctly using the "disjoint union" operator, $\sqcup$:

$$X_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup X_n \subseteq C$$

Some parts of the cake may remain unallocated — free disposal is assumed.

An S-allocation X is called *envy-free* if the utility of an agent from his allocated S-piece is at least as large as his utility from every piece allocated to another agent:

$$\forall i, j \in \{1, ..., n\} : \ V_i^S(X_i) \geq V_i^S(X_j)$$

In addition to envy-freeness, an allocation is assessed by the the fraction of the total cake value that is given to each agent. An allocation is called *proportional* if every agent receives a piece worth for him at least $1/n$ of the total cake value. Since a proportional S-allocation does not always exist (see e.g. Figure 1), we define:

Definition 2.1. (a) For a cake C, a family of usable pieces S and an integer $n \geq 1$, the **envy-free proportionality** of C, S and n, marked $\text{PropEF}(C, S, n)$, is the largest fraction $p \in [0, 1]$ such that, for every set of n value measures $(V_i, ..., V_n)$, there exists an envy-free S-allocation $(X_1, ..., X_n)$ for which: [10]

$$\forall i : \frac{V_i(X_i)}{V_i(C)} \geq p$$

(b) The **proportionality** of C, S and n, marked $\text{Prop}(C, S, n)$, in defined exactly the same way, with the only difference being that all allocations are considered, rather than just the envy-free ones. [11]

[10] Shortly: $\text{PropEF}(C, S, n) = \inf_V \sup_X \min_i V_i(X_i)/V_i(C)$, where the infimum is on all combinations of n value measures $(V_1, ..., V_n)$, the supremum is on all envy-free S-allocations $(X_1, ..., X_n)$ and the minimum is on all agents $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$.

[11] Note that the denominator in the proportionality definition is $V_i(C)$ — the value of the entire cake. This means that even for a single agent the proportionality might be less than 1 (e.g, if the cake is non-square but the agent wants a square piece; see examples in Subsection 3.1). Alternatively, we could define the proportionality with the denominator being $V_i^S(C)$ — the S-value of the entire cake. Then, the proportionality for a single agent would always be 1. We explored this alternative in our other paper [41] but decided to suppress it in the present paper for the sake of brevity.

Obviously, because the supremum in $\text{PropEF}(C,S,n)$ is taken over a smaller set:

$$\forall C,n,S : \text{PropEF}(C,S,n) \leq \text{Prop}(C,S,n)$$

This means that, in theory, if we want to guarantee that there is no envy, we may have to "pay" in terms of proportionality. One of the goals of the present research is to study if and how much we may have to pay.

Classic cake-cutting results imply that for every cake C:

$$\text{Prop}(C,\ \mathit{All},\ n) = \text{PropEF}(C,\ \mathit{All},\ n) = 1/n$$

where *All* is the collection of all Borel subsets of C. That is: when all pieces are usable, every cake can be divided among every group of n agents in an envy-free allocation in which the utility of each agent is at least $1/n$.

Our challenge in the rest of this paper will be to establish bounds on $\text{PropEF}(C,S,n)$ for various combinations of C and S. All our possibility results (lower bounds) are on $\text{PropEF}(C,S,n)$ and therefore are also valid for $\text{Prop}(C,S,n)$; similarly, all our impossibility results (upper bounds) are for $\text{Prop}(C,S,n)$ and therefore are also valid for $\text{PropEF}(C,S,n)$.

Strategy considerations: For the sake of simplicity, we present our division procedures as if all agents act according to their true value functions. However, the guarantees of the procedures are valid for any *single* agent who acts according to his own value function. E.g, the procedure of Theorem 2(c) guarantees that every agent acting according to his true value function receives a piece with a utility of at least $1/n$ and at least as good as the other pieces, regardless of what the other agents do. This is the common practice in the cake-cutting world.

3. Geometric Preliminaries

Example 1.1 illustrates that, in order to achieve a fair division that respects the geometric preferences, we should constrain the ways in which agents are allowed to cut the cake. This requires several definitions of geometric concepts, which are the topic of the present section.

3.1. Geometric loss

A key geometric concept in our analysis is the *geometric loss* — the maximum factor by which the utility of an agent can be reduced by his insistence on using pieces only from family S.

Definition 3.1. For a piece C and family of usable pieces S, the *geometric loss* factor of C relative to S is:

$$\text{Loss}(C,S) := \sup_V \frac{V(C)}{V^S(C)}$$

where the supremum is over all finite absolutely-continuous value measures V having $V^S(C) > 0$. If there is no supremum, then we write $\text{Loss}(C,S) = \infty$.

When $C \in S$ the loss is 1, which means is no loss, since in this case $V^S(C) = V(C)$. When $C \notin S$, the loss is generally larger than 1. For example, if C is a 30-by-20 rectangle. The largest square contained in C is 20-by-20. Hence, if the value density is uniform over C (as in Figure 3/a), then $\frac{V(C)}{V^S(C)} = \frac{600}{400} = \frac{3}{2}$, implying that $\text{Loss}(C,\ \mathit{Squares}) \geq 3/2$. But the loss may be larger: suppose V is uniform over the right and left sides of C (as in Figure 3/b). In this case $\frac{V(C)}{V^S(C)} = 2$, implying that $\text{Loss}(C,\ \mathit{Squares}) \geq 2$. As we will see in Subsection 3.3, the loss in this case is exactly 2, and



Figure 3: Geometric loss factors relative to the family of squares.

in general the loss of a rectangle with a length/width ratio of L is $\lceil L \rceil$; a thinner rectangle has a larger loss.

For some combinations of C and S, the geometric loss factor might be infinite. For example, if C is a circle and that V is nonzero only in a very narrow strip near the perimeter (as in Figure 3/c), any square contained in C intersects the valuable strip only in the corners. and the intersection might be arbitrarily small. Hence, $V^S(C)$ might be arbitrarily small and $\text{Loss}(C, \mathit{Squares}) = \infty$.

3.2. Chooser Lemma

We now relate the geometric loss factor to cake partitions. Our goal is to prove that, if a cake is partitioned such that the sum of the geometric losses of its parts is sufficiently small, then an agent can choose at least one part with a large value. Formally:

Lemma 3.2. *For every cake C, integer m, partition $X_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup X_m = C$, family S and value measure V:*

$$\exists j : V^S(X_j) \geq \frac{V(C)}{\sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathit{Loss}(X_i, S)}$$

Proof. Denote the denominator in the right-hand side by:

$$\text{Loss}(X, S) := \sum_{i=1}^{m} \text{Loss}(X_i, S)$$

By additivity of V:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} V(X_i) = V(C) \tag{1}$$

Multiply both sides of (1) by the $\text{Loss}(X, S) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \text{Loss}(X_i, S)$:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} V(X_i) \cdot \text{Loss}(X, S) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \text{Loss}(X_i, S) \cdot V(C)$$

By the pigeonhole principle, at least one of the m summands in the left-hand side must be greater than or equal to the corresponding summand in the right-hand side. I.e., there exists j for which:

$$V(X_j) \cdot \text{Loss}(X, S) \geq \text{Loss}(X_j, S) \cdot V(C)$$



Figure 4: Cover numbers of several geometric shapes.

By Definition 3.1 and the definition of supremum, for every value measure V:

$$\text{Loss}(X_j, S) \geq \frac{V(X_j)}{V^S(X_j)}$$

Combining the above two inequalities yields:

$$V(X_j) \cdot \text{Loss}(X, S) \geq \frac{V(X_j) \cdot V(C)}{V^S(X_j)}$$

which is equivalent to:

$$V^S(X_j) \geq \frac{V(C)}{\text{Loss}(X, S)}$$

□

Motivated by the Chooser Lemma and its proof, we define the expression $\text{Loss}(X, S) := \sum_{i=1}^{m} \text{Loss}(X_i, S)$ as the *geometric loss of the partition* X. The Chooser Lemma implies that *smaller* geometric-loss is *better* for the chooser. This is easy to see in Example 1.1, where a 100-by-100 land-estate is divided using cut-and-choose:

- A partition to 100-by-1 and 100-by-99 rectangles has a geometric loss of 102 (the loss of the 100-by-1 sliver is 100 and the loss of the 100-by-99 rectangle is 2). Hence, the utility guarantee for a chooser who wants square pieces is only 1/102.
- In contrast, a partition to two 100-by-50 rectangles has a geometric loss of 4 (2+2). By Lemma 3.2, the chooser can always get a square with a utility of at least 1/4.

We will often use this simple implication of the Chooser Lemma:

Corollary 3.3 (Chooser Corollary)**.** *Suppose a cake-partition has a geometric loss of at most M. Each of two agents chooses a best piece, and the choices are different. Then the resulting allocation is envy-free, and each agent's value is at least $1/M$ of the total cake-value.*

3.3. Cover Numbers and Cover Lemma

Since smaller geometric loss is better, it is useful to have an upper bound on the geometric loss.

Definition 3.4. For a cake C and family S, $CoverNum(C, S)$ is the smallest number of S-pieces whose union is exactly C.

Some examples are depicted in Figure 4.

Lemma 3.5. *For every cake C and family S:*

$$\mathit{Loss}(C,S) \;\le\; \mathit{CoverNum}(C,S)$$

Proof. Let $m = \mathrm{CoverNum}(C,S)$. By definition of CoverNum, there are m S-pieces $X_1,...,X_m$, possibly overlapping, that cover the cake C:

$$X_1 \cup X_2 \cup ... \cup X_m = C$$

Let V be any value measure. By additivity:

$$V(X_1) + V(X_2) + ... + V(X_m) \ge V(C)$$

By the pigeonhole principle, there is at least one piece $X_i \in S$ with:

$$V(X_i) \ge V(C)/m$$

On the other hand, since X_i is an S-piece contained in C, its value is bounded by the supremum V^S:

$$V^S(C) \ge V(X_i)$$

Combining the above two inequalities yields:

$$V^S(C) \ge V(C)/m$$

Combining this into the definition $\mathrm{Loss}(C,S) = \sup_V \frac{V(C)}{V^S(C)}$, yields:

$$\mathrm{Loss}(C,S) \le \sup_V \frac{V(C)}{V(C)/m} = \sup_V m = m$$

□

By Definition 3.1, for every value measure V: $V^S(C) \ge \frac{V(C)}{\mathrm{Loss}(C,S)}$. By Lemma 3.5, this implies $V^S(C) \ge \frac{V(C)}{\mathrm{CoverNum}(C,S)}$. Thus, for example, in the 30×20 rectangle of Figure 3, $\mathrm{CoverNum}(C, \mathit{Squares}) = 2$ so $\mathrm{Loss}(C, \mathit{Squares}) \le 2$ so $V^S(C) \ge V(C)/2$. This means that every agent, with any value measure, can get from C a utility of at least half its total value.

3.4. Knife functions

Moving knives have been used to cut cakes ever since the seminal paper of Dubins and Spanier [19]. We generalize the concept of a moving knife to handle geometric shape constraints.

Definition 3.6. Given a cake C, a *knife function on C* is a function K_C from the real interval $[0,1]$ to Borel subsets of C with the following *monotonicity* property: for every $t' \ge t$, $K_C(t') \supseteq K_C(t)$.

If $K_C(0) = C_0$ and $K_C(1) = C_1$, where $C_0 \subseteq C_1 \subseteq C$, we say that K_C is *a knife function from C_0 to C_1*.

The *complement* of K_C, marked $\overline{K_C}$, is defined by:

$$\overline{K_C}(t) := C \setminus K_C(t)$$

Some examples are shown in Figure 5.

A knife function K_C on a cake C can be used to attain an envy-free division of C between two agents:


a. $Loss(K_C, Squares) = \infty$
$Loss(K_C, Rectangles) = 2$
b. $Loss(K_C, Squares) = 4$
$Loss(K_C, Rectangles) = 4$
c. $Loss(K_C, Squares) = 3$
$Loss(K_C, Rectangles) = 3$
d. $Loss(K_C, Squares) = 4$
$Loss(K_C, Rectangles) = 3$
e. $Loss(K_C, Squares) = \infty$
$Loss(K_C, Rectangles) = 3$

Figure 5: Several knife functions. The area filled with horizontal lines marks $K_C(t)$ in a certain intermediate time $t \in (0, 1)$. Dotted lines mark future knife locations.

Generic Knife Procedure

Each agent $i \in \{A, B\}$ selects a time $t_i \in [0, 1]$ such that:

$$V_i^S(K_C(t_i)) = V_i^S(\overline{K_C}(t_i))$$

Rename the agents, if needed, such that $t_A \leq t_B$.
Select any time $t^* \in [t_A, t_B]$.
Give $K_C(t^*)$ to agent A and $\overline{K_C}(t^*)$ to agent B.

This procedure obviously generates an envy-free division, since it gives to each agent a piece worth for him at least as much as the other piece. The challenge is in the first step: we must be sure that each agent i can, indeed, select a time t_i such that the S-values on both sides of the knife are equal. This requires that both $V_i^S(K_C(t))$ and $V_i^S(\overline{K_C}(t))$ change continuously as a function of t. Hence, we define:

Definition 3.7. Given a family S of usable shapes, a knife-function K is called *S-good* if for every absolutely-continuous value-measure V, both $V^S(K(t))$ and $V^S(\overline{K}(t))$ are continuous functions of t.

How can we find S-good knife-functions? In Appendix A, we define two different properties of knife-functions, each of which is a sufficient condition for S-goodness:

- *S-smoothness* means that the Lebesgue measure of $K(t)$ is a continuous function of t, and that both $K(t) \in S$ and $\overline{K}(t) \in S$. For example, the knife-function in Figure 5/a is rectangle-smooth (but not square-smooth).
- *S-continuity* means (informally) that all S-pieces in $K(t)$ grow continuously and all S-pieces in $\overline{K}(t)$ shrink continuously; no S-piece with a positive area is created abruptly in $K(t)$ and no S-piece with a positive area is destroyed abruptly in $\overline{K}(t)$. All knife-functions in Figure 5 are square-continuous (and also rectangle-continuous).

See Appendix A for formal definitions, proofs and additional examples.

With an S-good knife, the Generic Knife Procedure can be executed:

Lemma 3.8. *Let C be a cake and C_0, C_1 pieces such that: $C_0 \subseteq C_1 \subseteq C$. Let K_C be an S-good knife-function from C_0 to C_1. Assume that an agent has a value function V such that:*

- $V^S(C_0) \leq V^S(C \setminus C_0)$
- $V^S(C_1) \geq V^S(C \setminus C_1)$

Then there exists a time $t_i \in [0,1]$ in which the utilities on both sides of the knife are equal:

$$V^S(K_C(t_i)) = V^S(\overline{K_C(t_i)})$$

Proof. When $t = 0$:

$$V^S(K_C(t)) = V^S(C_0) \leq V^S(C \setminus C_0) = V^S(\overline{K_C(t)})$$

and when $t = 1$:

$$V^S(K_C(t)) = V^S(C_1) \geq V^S(C \setminus C_1) = V^S(\overline{K_C(t)})$$

Since K_C is S-good, by Definition 3.7 both $V^S(K_C(t))$ and $V^S(\overline{K_C(t)})$ are continuous functions of t. Hence the lemma follows from the intermediate value theorem. □

3.5. Geometric loss of knife functions

When a knife function K_C is "stopped" at a certain time $t \in [0,1]$, it induces a partition of the cake C to the part which was already covered by the knife, $K_C(t)$, and the part not covered, $\overline{K_C}(t)$. Based on this partition, the geometric loss of the knife can be defined:

Definition 3.9. Let C be a cake, K_C a knife function on C and S a family of pieces. Define the *geometric loss* of K_C as:

$$\text{Loss}(K_C,\, S) = \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \left(\text{Loss}(K_C(t),\, S) + \text{Loss}(\overline{K_C}(t),\, S) \right)$$

Whenever a knife is stopped, the resulting partition has a geometric loss of at most $Loss(K_C, S)$. Therefore, we can expect such a knife to be useful for fairly dividing a cake among agents who want S-pieces.

Recall that the smallest possible Loss of a single piece is 1 (which means "no loss"); hence the smallest possible loss of a knife function is 1+1=2. Some examples are illustrated in Figure 5, from left to right:

(a) Let $C = [0, L] \times [0, 1]$ and $K_C(t) = [0, L] \times [0, t]$. Both $K_C(t)$ and its complement are rectangles so their geometric loss relative to the family of rectangles is 1. Hence $\text{Loss}(K_C,\, \mathit{Rectangles}) = 1 + 1 = 2$. In contrast, the geometric loss of these rectangles relative to the family of squares is unbounded, so: $\text{Loss}(K_C,\, \mathit{Squares}) = \infty$.

(b) Let $C = [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ and $K_C(t) = [0, t] \times [0, t] \cup [1 - t, 1] \times [1 - t, 1]$. For every t, $K_C(t)$ is a union of two squares and its complement is also a union of two squares. By the Cover Lemma, each such union has a geometric loss of 2 (relative to the family of squares). Hence, $\text{Loss}(K_C,\, \mathit{Squares}) = 2 + 2 = 4$.

(c) Let C be the top-right quarter-plane and S the family of squares and quarter-planes (we consider a quarter-plane to be a square with infinite side-length). Define: $K_C(t) = [0, x/(1 - x)] \times$

$[0, x/(1-x)]$. $K_C(t)$ is a square and its complement can be covered by two quarter-planes, so the geometric loss of K_C is 1+2=3.

(d) Let $C = [0,2] \times [0,2]$ and $K_C(t) = [0,t] \times [0,t]$. Note that $K_C(0) = \emptyset$ and $K_C(1) = [0,1] \times [0,1]$ = the bottom-left quarter of C. For every t, $K_C(t)$ is a square and its complement is an L-shape, similar to the L-shapes in Figure 4, which can be covered by 3 squares. Hence, $\text{Loss}(K_C, \mathit{Squares}) = 3 + 1 = 4$.

(e) Let $C = [0,2] \times [0,2]$, $C_1 = C \setminus [0,1] \times [0,1]$ (an L-shape), and $K_C(t) = C_1 \cap ([0,2] \times [0,t/2])$. This is a knife-function from $\emptyset$ to C_1; it covers C_1 continuously from bottom to top. The partition can be covered by at most 2+1=3 rectangles, but its square-loss is not bounded.

Lemma 3.10. *(Knife Lemma) Let C be a cake and C_0, C_1 pieces such that: $C_0 \subseteq C_1 \subseteq C$. Let K_C be an S-good knife-function from C_0 to C_1. If there are two agents and for every agent i:*

- $V_i^S(C_0) \leq V_i^S(C \setminus C_0)$ and

- $V_i^S(C_1) \geq V_i^S(C \setminus C_1)$,

then C can be divided using the Generic Knife Procedure (see Subsection 3.4) and every agent playing by the rules is guaranteed an envy-free share with a utility of at least:

$$\max\left(V_i^S(C_0),\, V_i^S(C \setminus C_1),\, \frac{1}{\mathit{Loss}(K_C,\, S)}\right)$$

Proof. Consider an agent, say Alice, who plays by the rules and declares a time t_A for which $V_A^S(K_C(t_A)) = V_A^S(\overline{K_C(t_A)})$. Denote this equal utility by U. There are two cases: if $t_A \leq t^* \leq t_B$, then Alice receives $K_C(t^*)$, which contains $K_C(t_A)$. Otherwise, $t_B \leq t^* \leq t_A$, and Alice receives $\overline{K_C(t^*)}$, which contains $\overline{K_C(t_A)}$ (because K_C is monotonically increasing). In both cases, Alice feels no envy and receives a utility of at least U. This utility is bounded from below in three ways:

(a) $U \geq V^S(C_0)$, because the piece $K_C(t_i)$ contains C_0.

(b) $U \geq V^S(C \setminus C_1)$, because the complement piece $\overline{K_C(t_i)}$ contains $C \setminus C_1$.

(c) $U \geq 1/\text{Loss}(K_C, S)$ by the Chooser Lemma, since the loss of the partition is at most $\text{Loss}(K_C, S)$. □

Note that the Generic Knife Procedure is discrete: it does not need to continuously move the knife until an agent shouts "stop"; the agents are asked in advance in what time they would like to "stop the knife".

The Chooser Lemma and the Knife Lemma are the main tools we use to construct division procedures.

4. Envy-Free Division For Two agents

4.1. Squares and rectangles

Our first generic envy-free division procedure is based on a single knife function.

Lemma 4.1. (Single Knife Procedure). *Let C be a cake, S a family of pieces and $M \geq 2$ an integer. If there exists an S-good knife-function K_C from $\emptyset$ to C with*

$$\mathit{Loss}(K_C,\, S) \leq M,$$

then

$$\mathit{PropEF}(C, S, 2) \geq 1/M.$$

Proof. The cake can be divided using the Generic Knife Procedure, taking $C_0 = \emptyset$ and $C_1 = C$. The assumptions of the Knife Lemma (3.10) hold trivially because $C_0 = C \setminus C_1 = \emptyset$. Hence each agent playing by the rules receives an envy-free share worth at least $1/M$. □

The knife function in Figure 5/b is Square-good and its Square-loss is 4. Applying Lemma 4.1 to that knife function yields our first sub-theorem:

Theorem 1(a). PropEF(*Square*, *Squares*, 2) $\geq 1/4$

The generality of Lemma 4.1 allows us to get more results with no additional effort. For example:

- By the knife function of Figure 5/b: PropEF(*Square*, *Square pairs*, 2) $\geq 1/2$. I.e., if each agent has to receive a union of two squares (as is common when dividing land to settlers, e.g. one land-plot for building and another one for agriculture, etc.), then a proportional division is possible since the knife function in example (b) has a geometric loss of 2 relative to the family of square pairs.
- By Figure 5/c: PropEF(*Quarter Plane*, *Generalized Squares*, 2) $\geq 1/3$.

All bounds presented above are tight in the strong sense stated in the introduction, i.e., it is not possible to guarantee both agents a larger utility *even if envy is allowed*. This is obvious for the $\geq 1/2$ results, since a proportionality of $1/n$ is the best that can be guaranteed to n agents. For the other results, the matching upper bound is proved in Appendix B (Figure B.15/a,b).

4.2. Cubes and archipelagos

In some cases it may be difficult to find a single knife function that covers the entire cake. This is so, for example, when the cakes are multi-dimensional cubes or unions of disjoint squares. To handle such cases, the following lemma suggests a generalized division procedure employing several knife functions.

Lemma 4.2. (Single Partition Procedure). *Let C be a cake, S a family of pieces and $M \geq 2$ an integer such that:*

(a) C has a partition with a geometric loss of at most M:

$$\bigsqcup_{j=1}^{m} C_j = C$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m} Loss(C_j, S) \leq M$$

(b) For every j, there are S-good knife functions from $\emptyset$ to C_j and from $\emptyset$ to $\overline{C_j}$ (where $\overline{C_j} := C \setminus C_j$).

(c) For every part C_j, the geometric loss of the knife-function on C_j is at most M:

$$\forall j: \; Loss(K_{C_j}, S) \leq M$$

Then:

$$PropEF(C, S, 2) \geq 1/M$$



Figure 6: (a) A cake made of a union of 3 disjoint rectangles.
(b) Three knife functions, each having a geometric loss of at most 4, proving that PropEF(C, *rectangles*, 2) $\geq 1/4$.

Proof. C can be divided using the following procedure.

(1) Each agent chooses the part C_j that gives him maximum utility. If the choices are different, then by the Chooser Corollary and condition (a), each agent receives an envy-free share worth at least $1/M$, so we are done

(2) If both agents chose the same part C_j, then ask each agent to choose either C_j or $\overline{C_j}$ (where $\overline{C_j} := C \setminus C_j$). If the choices are different, then by the Chooser Corollary and condition (a), each agent receives an envy-free share worth at least $1/M$, so we are done. If the choices are identical then there are two cases:

(3-a) Both agents chose C_j. By condition (c), there exists a knife function K_{C_j} from $\emptyset$ to C_j with a geometric loss of at most M. Apply the Generic Knife Procedure with that knife function. The requirements of the Knife Lemma (3.10) are satisfied since for both agents, $V_i^S(\emptyset) \leq V_i^S(C \setminus \emptyset)$ (trivially) and $V_i^S(C_j) \geq V_i^S(C \setminus C_j)$ (both agents preferred C_j to $\overline{C_j}$). Hence, the Knife Lemma guarantees each agent an envy-free share worth at least $1/\text{Loss}(K_{C_j}, S) \geq 1/M$.

(3-b) Both agents chose $\overline{C_j}$. By condition (b), there exists a knife function $K_{\overline{C_j}}$ from $\emptyset$ to $\overline{C_j}$. There is no guarantee about the geometric loss of $K_{\overline{C_j}}$, but this is fine since we will not use its geometric loss below. Apply the Generic Knife Procedure. The requirements of the Knife Lemma (3.10) are met since for both agents, $V_i^S(\emptyset) \leq V_i^S(C \setminus \emptyset)$ (trivially) and $V_i^S(\overline{C_j}) \geq V_i^S(C \setminus \overline{C_j})$ (both agents preferred $\overline{C_j}$ over C_j). The Knife Lemma guarantees each agent an envy-free share with a utility of at least $V_i^S(C \setminus \overline{C_j}) = V_i^S(C_j)$. The fact that in step (2) both agents chose C_j implies, by the Chooser Lemma, that $\forall i : V_i^S(C_j) \geq 1/M$. □

Several applications of Lemma 4.2 are presented below.

(a) PropEF($Square, Squares, 2$) $\geq 1/4$. *Proof*: A square cake can be partitioned to a 2-by-2 grid of squares. The loss of the partition relative to the family of squares is 4, satisfying condition (a). Each quarter C_j has a knife-function with a loss of 4 (see Figure 5/d), satisfying condition (c). For each complement $\overline{C_j}$, we can use e.g. a sweeping-line knife-function, as illustrated in Figure 5/e (see Lemma A.7 in the appendix for a proof that such functions are S-good), satisfying condition (b).

The advantage of this result over the identical result presented in the previous subsection is that it can be easily generalized to higher dimensions:

(b) **Multi-dimensional cakes**: PropEF($d\,dimensional\,cube, Squares, 2$) $\geq 1/2^d$. *Proof*: C can be partitioned to 2^d sub-cubes of equal side-length. For each sub-cube C_j there is a knife function analogous to Figure 5/d — a cube growing from the corner towards the center of C. Its geometric loss is 2^d. For each complement $\overline{C_j}$, there is a sweeping-plane knife-function (analogous to Figure 5/e, as described in Lemma A.7).

(c) **Archipelagos**: Let C be an archipelago which is a union of m disjoint rectangular islands. Then PropEF(C, *Rectangles*, 2) $\geq \frac{1}{m+1}$. *Proof*: The geometric loss of the partition of C to m rectangles is obviously $m < m+1$, satisfying condition (a). For each part C_j, define a knife function K_{C_j} based on a line sweeping from one side of the rectangle to the other side, similar to Figure 5/a. $K_{C_j}(t)$ is always a rectangle. Its complement can be covered by m rectangles: one rectangle to cover $C_j \setminus K_{C_j}(t)$ and additional $m-1$ rectangles to cover $C \setminus C_j$. Hence the geometric loss of every K_{C_j} is $1+1+m-1 = m+1$, satisfying condition (c) (see Figure 6). A similar sweeping-line knife-function can be used for the complements, satisfying condition (b).

(d) Let C be an archipelago which is a union of m disjoint square islands. Then PropEF(C, *Squares*, 2) $\geq \frac{1}{m+3}$. The proof is the same as in (c), the only difference being that each of the knife functions on the C_j is a union of two squares, similar to Figure 5/b.

All bounds proved above are tight. The tightness of (a) is proved in Appendix B, Figure B.15/a. The tightness of (b) can be proved by an analogous d-dimensional cake, with a water-pool in each of its 2^d corners. (c) is tight in the following sense: for every m there is a cake C, which is a union of m disjoint rectangles, having Prop(C, *Rectangles*, 2) $\leq \frac{1}{m+1}$. See Appendix B, Figure B.15/c. (d) is tight in a similar sense by a similar proof.

4.3. Fat rectangles

More types of cakes can be handled by adding partition steps.

Lemma 4.3. (Multiple Partition Procedure). *Let C be a cake, S a family of pieces and $M \geq 2$ an integer such that:*

(a) C has a partition $C_1, \ldots, C_m$ with a geometric loss of at most M:

$$\bigsqcup_{j=1}^{m} C_j = C$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m} Loss(C_j, S) \leq M$$

(b) Every part C_j can be further partitioned such that, if C_j is replaced with its partition, then the geometric loss of the resulting partition of C is at most M, i.e. for every j there exist $C_j^1, \ldots, C_j^{m_j}$ with:

$$\bigsqcup_{k=1}^{m_j} C_j^k = C_j$$

$$\sum_{j' \neq j} Loss(C_{j'}, S) + \sum_{k=1}^{m_j} Loss(C_j^k, S) \leq M$$

(c) For every j, k, there are S-good knife functions from $\emptyset$ to C_j and to $\overline{C_j}$ and to C_j^k and to $\overline{C_j^k}$.

(d) For every j, k, the geometric loss of the knife function from $\emptyset$ to C_j^k is at most M:

$$\forall j,k: \; Loss(K_{C_j^k}, S) \leq M$$

Then:

$$PropEF(C, S, 2) \geq 1/M$$

(a)



Figure 7: A knife function with a geometric loss of 3, proving that PropEF(C, 2 *fat rectangles*, 2) $\geq 1/3$.

Proof. The proof uses a refinement of the procedure used to prove Lemma 4.2. Steps (1) and (2) and (3-b) are exactly the same. We have to refine case (3-a), in which both agents prefer C_j over $\overline{C_j}$.

(3-a-1) Refine the partition of C by replacing C_j with its sub-partition:

$$(\bigsqcup_{j' \neq j} C_{j'}) \sqcup (\bigsqcup_{k=1}^{m_j} C_j^k) = C$$

Let each agent choose a best part from this refined partition. If the choices are different, then by condition (b) and the Chooser Corollary, each agent receives an envy-free share worth at least $1/M$.

(3-a-2) If both agents chose the same part from the main partition, e.g. $C_{j'}$ for some $j' \neq j$, then by condition (c) there exists a knife-function *from* $\emptyset$ *to* C_j (the part chosen by both agents at step 2). Apply the Generic Knife Procedure. The requirements of the Knife Lemma (3.10) are satisfied since for both agents, $V_i^S(\emptyset) \leq V_i^S(C \setminus \emptyset)$ (trivially) and $V_i^S(C_j) \geq V_i^S(C \setminus C_j)$ (both agents prefer C_j to $\overline{C_j}$). The Knife Lemma guarantees each agent an envy-free share with utility at least $V_i^S(\overline{C_j})$. This $\overline{C_j}$ contains all other parts of the main partition, including $C_{j'}$. The fact that both agents chose $C_{j'}$ in the refined partition proves, by the Chooser Lemma, that $V_i^S(C_{j'}) \geq 1/M$. Hence also $V_i^S(\overline{C_j}) \geq 1/M$.

(3-a-3) If both agents chose the same part from the sub-partition, e.g. C_j^k for some k, then ask each agent to choose either C_j^k or $\overline{C_j^k}$ (where $\overline{C_j^k} := C \setminus C_j^k$). If the choices are different, then by condition (b) and the Chooser Corollary, each agent receives an envy-free share worth at least $1/M$. If the choices are identical then there are two cases:

(3-a-4-a) Both agents chose C_j^k. By condition (d), there exists a knife function $K_{C_j^k}$ from $\emptyset$ to C_j^k with a geometric loss of at most M. Apply the Generic Knife Procedure with that knife function. The requirements of the Knife Lemma (3.10) are satisfied since for both agents, $V_i^S(\emptyset) \leq V_i^S(C \setminus \emptyset)$ (trivially) and $V_i^S(C_j^k) \geq V_i^S(C \setminus C_j^k)$ (both agents preferred C_j^k over $\overline{C_j^k}$). Hence, the Knife Lemma guarantees each agent an envy-free share worth at least $1/\text{Loss}(K_{C_j^k}, S) \geq 1/M$.

(3-a-4-b) Both agents chose $\overline{C_j^k}$. By condition (c), there exists an S-good knife function from $\emptyset$ to $\overline{C_j^k}$. Apply the Generic Knife Procedure. The requirements of the Knife Lemma (3.10) are met since for both agents, $V_i^S(\emptyset) \leq V_i^S(C \setminus \emptyset)$ (trivially) and $V_i^S(\overline{C_j^k}) \geq V_i^S(C \setminus \overline{C_j^k})$ (both agents preferred $\overline{C_j^k}$ over C_j^k). The Knife Lemma guarantees each agent an envy-free share with utility at least $V_i^S(C \setminus \overline{C_j^k}) = V_i^S(C_j^k)$. The fact that in step (3-a-2) both agents chose C_j^k implies, by the Chooser Lemma, that $V_i^S(C_j^k) \geq 1/M$. □

Lemma 4.3 is used to get the second part of our Theorem 1:

Theorem 1(b). *For every $R \geq 2$:*

$$PropEF(R\,fat\,rectangle,\ R\,fat\,rectangles,\ 2) \geq 1/3$$

Proof. The proof relies on the following geometric fact: for every $R \geq 2$, an R-fat rectangle can be bisected to two R-fat rectangles using a straight line through the center of its longer sides (see Figure 7).

Apply Lemma 4.3 in the following way. Let C be an R-fat rectangle. Partition C in the middle of its longer side. The two halves are R-fat so the geometric loss of the partition is $1 + 1 < 3$, satisfying condition (a). Each half can be further partitioned along its longer side to two rectangles, which are also R-fat (each of these is exactly one quarter of C). When a part is replaced by its sub-partition, the geometric loss of the resulting partition is thus $2 + 1 = 3$, satisfying condition (b). Condition (c) is satisfied e.g. by knife-functions based on sweeping lines, as in Figure 5/e. For each quarter-rectangle, there is a knife function (growing from the corner towards the center, as in Figure 7) with a geometric loss of 3, satisfying condition (d). □

The bound of 1/3 is tight; see Appendix B, Figure B.15/d.

Lemma 4.3 can be further refined by adding more sub-partition steps. For example, by adding a third sub-partition step we can prove that if C is an archipelago of m disjoint R-fat rectangles (with $R \geq 2$) then:

$$\text{PropEF}(C,\ R\text{-fat rectangles},\ 2) \geq \frac{1}{m+2}$$

and this bound is tight. The proof is a analogous to examples (c) and (d) after Lemma 4.2.

Note that the impossibility results are valid when the pieces are R-fat rectangles for every finite R, while the impossibility result of the square in Figure B.15/b is valid for every $R < 2$. This implies that 2-fat rectangles are a good practical compromise between fatness and fairness: if we require fatter pieces ($R < 2$) then the proportionality guarantee drops from 1/3 to 1/4, while if we allow thinner pieces ($R > 2$) the proportionality remains 1/3 for all $R < \infty$.

4.4. Fat cakes of arbitrary shape

Our most general result involves cakes that are arbitrary Borel sets. The result is proved for cakes of any dimensionality; Figure 8 illustrates the proof for $d = 2$ dimensions.

Theorem 1(c). *For every $R \geq 1$, If C is R-fat and S is the family of $2R$-fat pieces then:*

$$PropEF(C, S, 2) = Prop(C, S, 2) = 1/2$$

Proof. The proof uses Lemma 4.2 (the Single Partition Procedure). We show a partition of C to two pieces and a knife-function on each piece. Scale, rotate and translate the cake C such that the largest cube contained in C is $B^- = [-1, 1]^d$ (Figure 8/a). By definition of fatness (see Subsection 1.1), C is now contained in a cube B^+ of side-length at most $2R$.

Using the hyperplane $x = 0$, bisect the cube B^- to two 2-by-1 boxes $B_1 = [-1, 0] \times [-1, 1]^{d-1}$ and $B_2 = [0, 1] \times [-1, 1]^{d-1}$. This hyperplane also bisects C to two parts, C_1 and C_2 (Figure 8/b). Every C_j contains B_j which contains a cube with a side-length of 1. Every C_j is of course still contained in B^+ which is cube with a side-length of $2R$. Hence every C_j is $2R$-fat. Hence the geometric loss of the partition $C = C_1 \sqcup C_2$, relative to the family or $2R$-fat objects, is 2, satisfying condition (a) of Lemma 4.2.

For every $j \in \{1, 2\}$, define the following knife function K_j on C_j (see Figure 8/c,d):



Figure 8: Dividing a general R-fat cake to two people.
(a) The R-fat cake C and its largest contained square B^- (the smallest containing square B^+ is not shown).
(b) The sub-cakes C_1 and C_2 (solid), the two rectangles B_1 and B_2 (dotted) and their largest contained squares (dashed).
(c) The knife function on C_1 in $t \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$.
(d) The knife function on C_1 in $t \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$.

- For $t \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, $K_j(t) = (B_j)^{2t}$, i.e., the box B_i dilated by a factor of $2t$. Hence $K_j(0) = \emptyset$ and $K_j(\frac{1}{2}) = B_j$.
- For $t \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, $K_j(t)$ is any knife-function from B_j to C_j with continuous Lebesgue-measure (see Subsection A.1 for a proof that such a function exists).

$K_j(t)$ is always $2R$-fat, since in $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$ it is a scaled-down version of the box B_j (which is 2-fat) and in $[\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ it contains B_j and is contained in the cube B^+. $C \setminus K_j(t)$ is also $2R$-fat, since it contains B_{3-j} and is contained in B^+. Moreover, the Lebesgue measure of $K_j(t)$ is a continuous function of t. Hence, by Subsection A.1, K_j is an S-good knife function, satisfying condition (b) of Lemma 4.2.

Since both K_j and $\overline{K_j}$ are $2R$-fat, the geometric loss of K_j relative to the family of $2R$-fat shapes is $1 + 1 = 2$, satisfying condition (c) of Lemma 4.2.

All conditions of Lemma 4.2 are satisfied, and its conclusion is exactly the claimed theorem. □

Theorem 1(c) implies that we can satisfy the two main fairness requirements: proportionality and envy-freeness, while keeping the allocated pieces sufficiently fat. The fatness guarantee means that each allotted piece: (a) contains a sufficiently *large* square, (b) is contained in a sufficiently *small* square. In the context of land division, these guarantees can be interpreted as follows: (a) Each land-plot has sufficient room for building a large house in a convenient shape (square); (b) The parts of the land that are valuable to the agent are close together, since they are bounded in a sufficiently small square.

Finally we note that a different technique leads to a version of Theorem 1(c) which guarantee that the pieces are not only $2R$-fat but also *convex* (if the original cake is convex); hence an agent can walk in a straight line from his square house to his valuable spots without having to enter or circumvent the neighbor's fields. See Appendix C for details.

4.5. Between envy-freeness end proportionality

For all cakes C and families of usable pieces S studied in this section, we proved that there exists a positive constant p such that $\text{PropEF}(C, S, 2) \geq p$. Moreover, for the cases in which $p < 1/2$, we proved in Appendix B that $\text{Prop}(C, S, 2) \leq p$ (for the cases in which $p = 1/2$ the latter inequality

is obvious). Since $\text{PropEF}(C,S,2) \leq \text{PropEF}(C,S,2)$ always, we get that for all settings studied here:

$$\text{PropEF}(C,S,2) = \text{Prop}(C,S,2)$$

In other words, in these cases, envy-freeness is compatible with the best possible partial-proportionality.

It is an open question whether this equality holds for *every* combination of cakes C and families S.

What *can* we say about the relation between proportionality and envy-freeness for arbitrary C and S? In addition to the trivial upper bound $\text{PropEF}(C,S,2) \leq \text{Prop}(C,S,2)$, we have the following lower bound:

Lemma 4.4. *For every cake C and family S:*

$$\mathit{PropEF}(C,S,2) \geq \mathit{Prop}(C,S,2) \cdot \inf_{s \in S} \mathit{PropEF}(s,S,2)$$

Proof. Let $p = \text{Prop}(C,S,2)$ and $e = \inf_{s \in S} \text{PropEF}(s,S,2)$. The following meta-procedure yields an envy-free partition of C in which the utility of each agent is at least $p \cdot e$.

By the definition of $\text{Prop}(C,S,2)$, there exists an S-allocation $X = (X_1, X_2)$ with a proportionality of at least p, i.e, each agent i receives an S-piece X_i with $V_i(X_i) \geq p$.

Ask each agent whether he envies the other agent and proceed accordingly:

(a) If no agent envies the other agent, then the partition is already envy-free. The utility of each agent is at least p, which is at least $p \cdot e$ (since $e \leq 1$).

(b) If both agents envy each other, then let them switch the pieces. The resulting partition is envy-free and the utility of each agent is more than $p \geq p \cdot e$.

(c) The remaining case is that only one agent envies the other agent. W.l.o.g, assume it is agent 1 who envies agent 2. This means that the S-piece X_2 has a utility of at least p to both agents. By the assumptions of the lemma, since $X_2 \in S$, $\text{PropEF}(X_2,S,2) \geq e$. Therefore, there exists an envy-free S-allocation of X_2 in which the utility of each agent i is at least $e \cdot V_i(X_2) \geq e \cdot p$. □

So by previous results we have the following partial-compatibility results for *every* cake C:

- $\text{Prop}(C,\ \mathit{Squares},\ 2) \geq \text{PropEF}(C,\ \mathit{Squares},\ 2) \geq \frac{1}{4}\text{Prop}(C,\ \mathit{Squares},\ 2)$
- $\text{Prop}(C,\ R\,\mathit{fat\,rects},\ 2) \geq \text{PropEF}(C,\ R\,\mathit{fat\,rects},\ 2) \geq \frac{1}{3}\text{Prop}(C,\ R\,\mathit{fat\,rects},\ 2)$ (for $R \geq 2$)
- $\text{Prop}(C,\ \mathit{Rectangles},\ 2) \geq \text{PropEF}(C,\ \mathit{Rectangles},\ 2) \geq \frac{1}{2}\text{Prop}(C,\ \mathit{Rectangles},\ 2)$

5. Envy-Free Division For n agents

5.1. The one-dimensional procedure

Existence of envy-free allocations in one dimension was first proved by Stromquist [43]. A procedure for finding such allocations was developed by Simmons and first described by Su [45]. Our procedure for n agents is a generalization of that procedure. We briefly describe the 1-dimensional procedure below.

The cake is the 1-dimensional interval $[0,1]$ and S is the family of intervals. A partition of the cake to n intervals can be described by a vector of length n whose elements are the lengths of the intervals. The sum of all lengths in a partition is 1, so the set of all partitions is an $(n-1)$-dimensional simplex in $\mathbb{R}^n$. The procedure proceeds as follows (see Figure 9):



Figure 9: An illustration of the Simmons-Su procedure for $n = 3$ agents, A B and C.
(a) A triangulation of the simplex of partitions in which each vertex is assigned to an agent.
(b) Each vertex is labeled with the index of the piece preferred by its assigned agent. The fully-labeled triangle is starred.
(c) The process is repeated with a finer triangulation of the original simplex.

(a) *Preparation.* Triangulate the simplex of partitions to a collection of $(n-1)$-dimensional sub-simplexes. Assign each vertex of the triangulation to one of the n agents, such that in each sub-simplex, all n agents are represented. Su shows that there always exists such a triangulation.

(b) *Evaluation.* Recall that each vertex of the triangulation corresponds to a partition of the cake to n intervals. For each vertex, ask its assigned agent: "if the cake is partitioned according to this vertex, which piece would you prefer?". The answer is an integer between 1 and n; label that vertex with that integer.

The labeling created in step (b) has a special structure. First, each of the n main vertexes of the large simplex corresponds to a partition in which a single piece $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ encompasses the entire cake and all other pieces are empty. Any agent prefers the entire cake over an empty piece, so this vertex will surely be labeled by i (see Figure 9/b, where the three vertexes of the large triangle are labeled by 1, 2 and 3). Moreover, each point on the segment between vertex i_1 and vertex i_2 corresponds to a partition in which the cake is divided between pieces i_1 and i_2, and all other pieces are empty. Therefore, each such point will be labeled by either i_1 or i_2. The same is true in any number of dimensions: in each face of the simplex, all interior points are labeled by one of the labels of the main vertexes that span that face. A labeling that has such a structure is called a *Sperner labeling*. By Sperner's lemma, any triangulation with a Sperner labeling has a *fully-labeled sub-simplex*, in which all vertexes are labeled differently.

(c) *Refinement.* Steps (a) and (b) can be repeated again and again, each time with a finer triangulation. This yields an infinite sequence of fully-labeled simplexes. By compactness of the simplex, there is a subsequence that converges to a single point. By the continuity of the agents' valuations, this point corresponds to a partition in which each of the n agents prefers a different piece. By definition, this partition is envy-free.

Note that the above procedure is infinite — the envy-free partition is found only at the limit of an infinite sequence. In fact, Stromquist [44] proved that when $n \geq 3$, an envy-free partition to n agents with connected pieces cannot be found by a finite procedure. Therefore, Simmons' infinite procedure is the best that can be hoped for. Deng and Qi and Saberi [18] show that an approximately-envy-free division can be found in bounded time. For example, suppose that an interval is divided among several agents and they all agree that a 1 centimeter movement of the border between their plots is irrelevant. Then the simplex of partitions can be divided to sub-simplices of side-length 1 cm. If the total length of the cake is L centimeters, then a fully-labeled

simplex can be found using $O(L^{n-2})$ queries [18, Theorem 5]. All points in that simplex correspond to a division that is approximately-envy-free up to the agents' tolerance.

5.2. Knife tuples

Both Stromquist's existence proof and the Simmons–Su and the Deng–Qi–Saberi algorithms do not work directly on the cake — they work on the unit simplex, each point of which represents a cake-partition. Therefore, we can extend these algorithms to two dimensions if we find an appropriate way to map each point of the unit simplex to a two-dimensional cake-partition.

Our main tool is a *knife-tuple* — an extension of the knife-function defined in Definition 3.6.

Definition 5.1. Given a cake C, an *n-knife-tuple on C* is a vector of n functions $(K_1, \ldots, K_n)$, which is a function from Δ^n (the $(n-1)$-dimensional unit-simplex in $\mathbb{R}^n$) to the partitions of C, such that for every nonempty subset of indexes $I \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\}$, if:

$$\sum_{i \in I} t_i = 1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \forall i \notin I : t_i = 0,$$

then the pieces whose indexes are in I form a partition of the cake and the other pieces are empty:

$$\bigsqcup_{i \in I} K_i(t_1, \ldots, t_n) = C \qquad \text{and} \qquad \forall i \notin I : K_i(t_1, \ldots, t_n) = \emptyset.$$

In particular, at endpoint #i of the simplex, piece #i comprises the entire cake. I.e, if $t_i = 1$ and $t_{i' \neq i} = 0$, then $K_i = C$ and $K_{i \neq i} = \emptyset$.

Knife-tuples can be constructed from knife-functions.

Lemma 5.2. *Let C be a cake and K a knife-function from $\emptyset$ to C. Define functions K_1, K_2:*

$$K_1(t_1, t_2) := K(t_1)$$
$$K_2(t_1, t_2) := C \setminus K(1 - t_2)$$

Then, (K_1, K_2) is a 2-knife-tuple on C.

Proof. We verify the knife-tuple property for all nonempty subset of indexes:

- On the unit simplex, $t_1 + t_2 = 1$, $K_1 = K(t_1)$ and $K_2 = C \setminus K(t_1)$ so indeed $K_1 \sqcup K_2 = C$.
- When $t_1 = 1$ and $t_2 = 0$, $K_1 = K(1) = C$ and $K_2 = C \setminus K(1) = \emptyset$.
- When $t_2 = 1$ and $t_1 = 0$, $K_1 = K(0) = \emptyset$ and $K_2 = C \setminus K(0) = C$.

□

Longer knife-tuples can be constructed recursively, by replacing an element of an existing knife-tuple with two elements separated by a knife-function. We exemplify this construction with a 3-knife-tuple.

Lemma 5.3. *Let C be a cake and (K_1, K_2) a 2-knife-tuple on C. Suppose that, for every t_1 and every $t_2 > 0$, we have a knife-function K^{t_1,t_2} from $\emptyset$ to $K_2(t_1, t_2)$. Then, replacing the function K_2 with two complementary functions K_2' and K_3' gives a 3-knife-tuple (K_1', K_2', K_3'):*

$$
\begin{aligned}
K_1'(t_1,t_2,t_3) := \quad & K_1(t_1, t_2 + t_3) & \\
K_2'(t_1,t_2,t_3) := \quad & K^{t_1,t_2+t_3}\left(\frac{t_2}{t_2+t_3}\right) & [t_2+t_3>0] \\
& \emptyset & [t_2+t_3=0] \\
K_3'(t_1,t_2,t_3) := \quad & K_2(t_1,t_2+t_3) \setminus K^{t_1,t_2+t_3}\left(\frac{t_2}{t_2+t_3}\right) & [t_2+t_3>0] \\
& \emptyset & [t_2+t_3=0]
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. We verify that (K_1', K_2', K_3') satisfies the knife-tuple property for all nonempty subsets of indexes. Recall that the knife-tuple property of the original (K_1, K_2) implies that: $K_1(1,0) = K_2(0,1) = C$ and $K_1(0,1) = K_2(1,0) = \emptyset$ and $K_1(t_1, 1-t_1) \sqcup K_2(t_1, 1-t_1) = C$.

- When $t_1 = 1$ and $t_2 = t_3 = 0$, $K_1' = K_1(1,0) = C$ and $K_2' = K_3' = \emptyset$ by definition.
- When $t_2 = 1$ and $t_1 = t_3 = 0$, $K_1' = K_1(0,1) = \emptyset$ and $K_2' = K^{0,1}(1) = K_2(0,1) = C$ and $K_3' = K_2(0,1) \setminus K^{0,1}(1) = \emptyset$.
- When $t_3 = 1$ and $t_1 = t_2 = 0$, $K_1' = K_1(0,1) = \emptyset$ and $K_2' = K^{0,1}(0) = \emptyset$ and $K_3' = K_2(0,1) \setminus K^{0,1}(0) = K_2(0,1) = C$.
- When $t_1 + t_2 = 1$ and $t_3 = 0$, $K_1' = K_1(t_1, t_2)$ and $K_2' = K^{t_1,t_2}(1) = K_2(t_1, t_2)$ so $K_1' \sqcup K_2' = K_1 \sqcup K_2 = C$, and $K_3' = 0$.
- When $t_1 + t_3 = 1$ and $t_2 = 0$, $K_1' = K_1(t_1, t_3)$ and $K_3' = K_2(t_1, t_3) \setminus K^{t_1,t_3}(0) = K_2(t_1, t_3)$ so $K_1' \sqcup K_3' = K_1 \sqcup K_3 = C$, and $K_2' = 0$.
- When $t_2 + t_3 = 1$ and $t_1 = 0$, $K_1' = K_1(0,1) = \emptyset$ and $K_2' = K^{0,1}(\frac{t_2}{t_2+t_3})$ and $K_3' = K_2(0,1) \setminus K^{0,1}(\frac{t_2}{t_2+t_3})$, so $K_2' \sqcup K_3' = K_2(0,1) = C$.
- When $t_1 + t_2 + t_3 = 1$, $K_2' \sqcup K_3' = K_2(t_1, t_2 + t_3)$, so $K_1' \sqcup K_2' \sqcup K_3' = K_1(t_1, t_2 + t_3) \sqcup K_2(t_1, t_2 + t_3) = C$.

□

So to build a 3-knife-tuple, we start with a single knife-function on C that cuts it to $K_1 \sqcup K_2$. Then, for every point in time, we use another knife-function on K_2 that cuts it to $K_2' \sqcup K_3'$. Alternatively, we can use a knife-function on K_1 that cuts it to $K_1' \sqcup K_3'$; the proof is entirely analogous.

An example of a 3-knife-tuple is shown in Figure 10. There, the first knife-function ($K_1 \equiv K_1'$) is a growing pair-of-squares, identical to the knife-function in Figure 5/b. K_2 is its complement (which is also a pair-of-squares). For every point in time, the second knife-function (K_2') is a growing union-of-four-squares. It starts at an empty set and grows until it covers all of K_2. K_3' is the remainder, which is also a union of four squares.

The previous lemma can be generalized to create knife-tuples of arbitrary length.

Lemma 5.4. *Let C be a cake and $(K_1, \ldots, K_n)$ an n-knife-tuple on C. Suppose that for some $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, for every $t_1, \ldots, t_n$ where $t_i > 0$, we have a knife-function $K^{t_1,\ldots,t_i,\ldots,t_n}$ from $\emptyset$ to $K_i(t_1, \ldots, t_i, \ldots, t_n)$. Then, replacing the index i with two indexes $i1$ and $i2$ and replacing the function K_i with two complementary functions K'_{i1} and K'_{i2} gives an $(n+1)$-knife-tuple $(K'_1, \ldots, K'_{i1}, K'_{i2}, \ldots, K'_n)$:*

$$\begin{aligned}
K'_{i1}(t_1, \ldots, t_{i1}, t_{i2}, \ldots, t_n) &:= K^{t_1,\ldots,t_{i1}+t_{i2},\ldots,t_n}\left(\frac{t_{i1}}{t_{i1}+t_{i2}}\right) && [t_{i1}+t_{i2} > 0] \\
&:= \emptyset && [t_{i1}+t_{i2} = 0] \\
K'_{i2}(t_1, \ldots, t_{i1}, t_{i2}, \ldots, t_n) &:= K_i(t_1, \ldots, t_{i1}+t_{i2}, \ldots, t_n) \setminus K^{t_1,\ldots,t_{i1}+t_{i2},\ldots,t_n}\left(\frac{t_{i1}}{t_{i1}+t_{i2}}\right) && [t_{i1}+t_{i2} > 0] \\
&:= \emptyset && [t_{i1}+t_{i2} = 0] \\
\forall j \neq i : K'_j(t_1, \ldots, , t_{i1}, t_{i2}, \ldots, t_n) &:= K_j(t_1, \ldots, t_{i1}+t_{i2}, \ldots, t_n)
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We verify that $(K'_1, \ldots, K'_{i1}, K'_{i2}, \ldots, K'_n)$ satisfies the knife-tuple property for every nonempty subset of indexes, I'. There are four cases, depending on whether I' contains $i1$ or $i2$ or both.

- $i1 \notin I'$ and $i2 \notin I'$. Then, $\sqcup_{j \in I'} K'_j = \sqcup_{j \in I'} K_j = C$ by the knife-tuple property of $(K_1, \ldots, K_n)$, and $K'_{i1} = K'_{i2} = \emptyset$ by definition.
- $i1 \in I'$ and $i2 \notin I'$. When $t_{i2} = 0$, $t_{i1}+t_{i2} = t_{i1}$, so $K'_{i1} = K^{t_1,\ldots,t_{i1},\ldots,t_n}(1) = K_i(t_1, \ldots, t_{i1}, \ldots, t_n)$. Define an alternative subset of indexes: $I := I' \setminus \{i1\} \cup \{i\}$. Then, $\sqcup_{j \in I'} K'_j = \sqcup_{j \in I} K_j = C$ by the knife-tuple property of $(K_1, \ldots, K_n)$, and $K'_{i2} = \emptyset$ by definition.
- $i2 \in I'$ and $i1 \notin I'$. When $t_{i1} = 0$, $t_{i1} + t_{i2} = t_{i2}$, so $K'_{i2} = K_i(t_1, \ldots, t_{i2}, \ldots, t_n) \setminus K^{t_1,\ldots,t_{i2},\ldots,t_n}(0) = K_i(t_1, \ldots, t_{i2}, \ldots, t_n)$. Define an alternative subset of indexes: $I := I' \setminus \{i2\} \cup \{i\}$. Then, $\sqcup_{j \in I'} K'_j = \sqcup_{j \in I} K_j = C$ by the knife-tuple property of $(K_1, \ldots, K_n)$, and $K'_{i1} = \emptyset$ by definition.
- $i2 \in I'$ and $i1 \in I'$. Note that when $t_i := t_{i1} + t_{i2}$, $K'_{i1} \sqcup K'_{i2} = K_i$. Define a subset of indexes $I := I' \setminus \{i1, i2\} \cup \{i\}$. Then, $\sqcup_{j \in I'} K'_j = \sqcup_{j \in I} K_j = C$ by the knife-tuple property of $(K_1, \ldots, K_n)$.

□

Definitions 3.9 and 3.7 can be naturally generalized from a knife-function to a knife-tuple:

Definition 5.5. The *geometric-loss* of a knife-tuple $(K_1, \ldots, K_n)$ is the supremum geometric loss of the resulting partitions:

$$\mathrm{Loss}((K_1, \ldots, K_n), S) := \sup_{(t_1,\ldots,t_n) \in \Delta^n} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathrm{Loss}(K_j(t_1, \ldots, t_n),\ S) \right)$$

In Figure 10, K'_1 can be covered by two squares and K'_2 and K'_3 can be covered by four squares each, so the square-geometric-loss of this 3-knife-tuple is 10.

Definition 5.6. A knife-tuple $(K_1, \ldots, K_n)$ is called *S-good* if for every $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and every absolutely-continuous value-measure V, the function $V^S(K_i(t_1, \ldots, t_n))$ is a continuous function of $t_1, \ldots, t_n$.



Figure 10: Four partitions induced by the 3-knife-tuple (K_1', K_2', K_3') in different points (t_1, t_2, t_3) of the unit-simplex. $K_1'(\cdot)$ is filled with horizontal blue lines, $K_2'(\cdot)$ is filled with vertical green lines and $K_3'(\cdot)$ is blank.

In the knife-tuple of Figure 10, the squares meet only at their corners, no square is created or destroyed abruptly, so the knife-tuple is square-good. This can be proved formally as in Appendix A.2; the details are omitted for the sake of brevity.

Lemma 5.7. *Let C be a cake and S a family of pieces. If there is an S-good n-knife-tuple on C with a geometric loss of at most M, then:*

$$PropEF(C, S, n) \geq 1/M$$

Proof. Use the Simmons–Su procedure described in Subsection 5.1. The Preparation step (a) is exactly the same. In the Evaluation step (b), for each vertex $(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ of the triangulation, use the n-knife-tuple to create the partition: $K_1(t_1, \ldots, t_n), \ldots, K_n(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$. Ask the owner of that vertex (e.g. agent i) to indicate its favorite piece in this partition, namely:

$$\arg \max_{j \in \{1,\ldots,n\}} V_i^S(K_j(t_1, \ldots, t_n))$$

and label that vertex with the agent's reply. By the properties of a knife-tuple, whenever $t_j = 0$, $K_j = \emptyset$, so $V_i^S(K_j) = 0$, so the agent will never reply j. Therefore, the resulting labeling is a Sperner labeling, so a fully-labeled sub-simplex exists.

By repeating steps (a) and (b) infinitely many times with finer and finer triangulations, we get a subsequence of fully-labeled triangles that converges to a single point. Because the knife-tuple is S-good, all agents' S-value functions are continuous, so the limit point corresponds to an envy-free partition. The loss of the knife-tuple is at most M, so the proportionality of the limit partition is at least $1/M$. [12] □

We now apply Lemma 5.7 to prove our Theorem 2.

5.3. Square cake and square pieces

Theorem 2(a). *For every $n \geq 1$:*

$$PropEF(Square, Squares, n) \geq \frac{1}{2^{2\lceil log_2 n \rceil}} > \frac{1}{4n^2}$$

[12] When $n = 3$, the three-knives procedure of Stromquist [43] can be used instead of Simmons' procedure.

Proof. For every n which is a power of 2, we construct an n-knife-tuple $(K_1, \ldots, K_n)$, in which for every $(t_1, \ldots, t_n) \in \Delta^n$, and for every $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ for which $t_j > 0$, $K_j(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ is a union of at most n squares. Hence, the partition induced by $(K_1, \ldots, K_n)$ has a geometric loss of $n \cdot n = n^2$.

The construction is recursive. The base is $n = 2$. Take the knife-function in Figure 5/b (a union of two corner-squares growing towards the center). By Lemma 5.2, it defines a 2-knife-tuple which we denote by: (K_1, K_2). For each t_1 and t_2, $K_1(t_1, t_2)$ and $K_2(t_1, t_2)$ are square-pairs (unions of two squares).

Consider next the case $n = 4$. In every square-pair in the above 2-knife-tuple, define a knife-function as shown in Figure 10 — a union of four corner-squares growing from opposite corners towards the center. By Lemma 5.4, we can replace K_1 by K'_1, K'_2 and K_2 by K'_3, K'_4. For each $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}, t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4$, $K_i(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4)$ is a union of four squares.

After l steps, we have a 2^l-knife-tuple in which each component is a union of 2^l squares. We split each component using a knife-function made of a union of 2^{l+1} squares growing from opposite corners. This gives a new, 2^{l+1}-knife-tuple in which each component is a union of 2^{l+1} squares. After $\log_2 n$ steps, we get the desired n-knife-tuple.

This knife-tuple is square-good since no squares are created or destroyed abruptly; this is apparent in the illustration, since the squares from opposite sides meet only at their corners. We suppress a formal proof of this geometric fact.

When n is not a power of two, it can be rounded to the next power of two — $2^{\lceil log_2 n \rceil}$. The geometric loss is then at most $2^{2\lceil log_2 n \rceil}$, which is always less than $4n^2$. □

Theorem 2(b). *If C is an R-fat rectangle and S the family of R-fat rectangles then:*

$$PropEF(C, S, n) \geq \frac{1}{2^{2\lceil log_2 n \rceil}} > \frac{1}{4n^2}$$

Proof. Scale the coordinate system such that C becomes a square. Use Theorem 2(a) and get a division with square pieces. Scale the coordinate system back. Now the pieces are R-fat rectangles. □

We do not know if the $1/(4n^2)$ lower bound is asymptotically tight. The best upper bound currently known [41] is $\text{Prop}(Square, squares, n) \leq 1/(2n)$. Moreover, there is a procedure for non-envy-free division that proves $\text{Prop}(Square, squares, n) \geq 1/(4n-4)$. We do not know if it is possible to attain an envy-free division with a proportionality of $1/O(n)$.

In the following subsection we show that it is possible to attain an envy-free *and proportional* division for every n, in return to a compromise on the family of usable pieces.

5.4. Fat cakes of arbitrary shape

Theorem 2(c). *Let C be a d-dimensional R-fat cake and $n \geq 2$ an integer. Let S be the family of mR-fat pieces, where m be the smallest integer such that $n \leq m^d$ (i.e. $m = \lceil n^{1/d} \rceil$). Then:*

$$PropEF(C, S, n) = 1/n$$

Proof. The proof is illustrated in Figure 11 for the case of $d = 2$ dimensions. Let C be an R-fat d-dimensional cake. By definition of fatness it contains a cube B^- of side-length x and it is contained in a parallel cube B^+ of side-length $R \cdot x$, for some $x > 0$.

Partition the cube B^- to a grid of m^d sub-cubes, $B_1, ..., B_{m^d}$, each of side-length $\frac{x}{m}$. For every i, denote by B_{-i} the union of all $m^d - 1$ squares different than B_i, i.e:

$$B_{-i} := \bigcup_{j \neq i} B_j = B^- \setminus B_i$$



Figure 11: Dividing a general R-fat cake to $n = 3$ people. K_1 is filled with horizontal lines, K_2 is filled with vertical lines and K_3 is white. Note that each of these three pieces is $2R$-fat, where R is the fatness of the original cake.

Denote by $\overline{B^-}$ the cake outside the enclosed cube, i.e:

$$\overline{B^-} := C \setminus B^-$$

Define the following knife function K on C (see Figure 11):

- For $t \in [0, \frac{1}{3}]$: $K(t) = (B_1)^{3t}$, i.e., the cube B_1 dilated by a factor of $3t$. Hence $K(0) = \emptyset$ and $K(\frac{1}{3}) = B_1$.
- For $t \in [\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}]$: $K(t)$ is any knife function from B_1 to $C \setminus B_{-1}$ with continuous Lebesgue measure. See Subsection A.1 for a proof that such a function exists.
- For $t \in [\frac{2}{3}, 1]$: $K(t)$ is $C \setminus [(B_{-1})^{3(1-t)}]$, i.e., the cake not yet covered by the knife is B_{-1} dilated by a factor proportional to the remaining time. Hence $K(1) = C$.

By Lemma 5.2, K induces a 2-knife-tuple (K_1, K_2) where $K_1 := K$ and $K_2 := C \setminus K_1$. For every t_1, t_2 with $t_1 + t_2 = 1$, $K_1(t_1, t_2)$ is mR-fat:

- When $t_1 \in [0, \frac{1}{3}]$, K_1 it is a cube, which is 1-fat.
- When $t_1 \in [\frac{1}{3}, 1]$, K_1 contains the cube B_1, whose side-length is x/m, and is contained in the cube B^+, whose side-length is $x \cdot R$.

and $K_2(t_1, t_2)$ is also mR-fat:

- When $t_1 \in [0, \frac{2}{3}]$, K_2 contains e.g. the cube B_n, whose side-length is x/m, and is contained in the larger cube B^+, whose side-length is $x \cdot R$.
- When $t_1 \in [\frac{2}{3}, 1]$, K_2 contains a dilated B_n and it is contained in a dilated B^-; since they are dilated by the same factor, the ratio between their side-lengths is always m.

For every t_1, t_2 with $t_1 + t_2 = 1$, we now define a knife-function K^{t_1,t_2} from $\emptyset$ to $K_2(t_1, t_2)$. K^{t_1,t_2} is analogous to K but uses the sub-cube B_2. This is possible because:

- When $t_1 \in [0, \frac{2}{3}]$, K_2 contains the cube B_2 itself;
- When $t_1 \in (\frac{2}{3}, 1]$, K_2 contains a dilated B_2, which is contained in a dilated B^+.

The function K^{t_1,t_2} is defined as follows:

- For $t \in [0, \frac{1}{3}]$: $K^{t_1,t_2}(t) = (B_2)^{3t}$.
- For $t \in [\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}]$: $K^{t_1,t_2}(t)$ is any knife-function from B_2 to $K_2 \setminus B_{-2}$ with continuous Lebesgue measure.
- For $t \in [\frac{2}{3}, 1]$: $K^{t_1,t_2}(t)$ is $K_2 \setminus [(B_{-2})^{3(1-t)}]$.

By Lemma 5.3, this induces a 3-knife-tuple (K'_1, K'_2, K'_3).

To define an n-knife-tuple, select arbitrary n pieces out of the m^2 pieces and proceed in a similar way. All components in the knife-tuple are mR-fat, and their Lebesgue measure changes continuously. Therefore, by the proofs in Subsection A.1, the knife-tuple is S-good, as required by Lemma 5.7. □



Figure 12: A fat cake in which every proportional division must use slim pieces. See Lemma 5.8.

Figure 11 shows an example of the construction for $d = 2$ dimensions and $n = 3$ agents. Here $m = \lceil \sqrt{3} \rceil = 2$ so each agent receives an envy-free $2R$-fat land-plot with a utility of at least $1/3$.

Theorem 2(c) implies that we can guarantee proportionality by compromising on the fatness of the pieces — allowing the pieces to be thinner than the cake by a factor of $\lceil n^{1/d} \rceil$. This factor is asymptotically optimal even when envy is allowed:

Lemma 5.8. *For every $R \geq 1$, there is an $(R+1)$-fat cake C for which, for every $m' \leq (n-1)^{1/d}$:*

$$\mathit{PropEF}(C,\, m'R\,\mathit{fat\,objects},\, n) \leq \mathit{Prop}(C,\, m'R\,\mathit{fat\,objects},\, n) < 1/n$$

Proof. Let δ, ϵ be small positive constants. Let C be a cake with the following two components:

- The left component is a cube with all sides of length 1;
- The right component is a box with one side of length R and the other sides of length δ.

See Figure 12 for an illustration for $d = 2$. C is contained in a cube of side-length $R + 1$ and it contains a cube of side-length 1, so it is $(R + 1)$-fat.

C represents a desert with the following water sources:

- The left cube contains $n - 1 + \epsilon$ water units;
- A small disc at the end of the right box contains $1 - \epsilon$ water units.

C has to be divided among n agents whose value functions are proportional to the amount of water. To get a proportional division, each agent must receive exactly 1 unit of water. This means that at least one piece, e.g. X_i, must overlap both the right pool and the left pool.

The smallest cube containing X_i has a side-length of at least R. For the largest cube contained in X_i, there are two options:

- If the largest contained cube is in the left side, then its side-length must be at most $\left(\frac{1}{n-1+\epsilon}\right)^{1/d}$, since it must contain at most 1 unit of water.
- If the largest contained cube is in the right side, then its side-length must be at most δ.

If δ is sufficiently small (in particular, $\delta < \left(\frac{1}{n-1}\right)^{1/d}$), then the piece X_i is not $m'R$-fat for every $m' \leq (n-1)^{1/d}$. This means that, if all pieces must be $m'R$-fat, a proportional division is impossible. □

6. Conclusion and Future Work

We presented the problem of fairly dividing a cake to agents whose utility functions depend on geometric shape. Our main contributions are several generic division procedures for envy-free division. For two agents, our procedures have the best possible partial-proportionality guarantees in various geometric scenarios. For n agents, our procedures guarantee a positive partial proportionality.

The tools developed in this paper are generic and can work for cakes and pieces of other geometric shapes. In fact, our tools reduce the envy-free division problem to a geometric problem — the problem of finding appropriate knife functions.

Some topics not covered in the present paper are:

- Utility functions that takes into account both the value contained in the best usable piece and the total value of the piece, e.g.: $U(X) = w \cdot V^S(X) + (1-w) \cdot V(X)$, where w is some constant.
- Absolute size constraints on the usable pieces instead of the relative fatness constraints studied here, e.g. let S be the family of all rectangles with length and width of at least 10 meters.
- Personal geometric preferences — letting each agent i specify a different family S_i of usable pieces.

7. Acknowledgments

This research was funded in part by the Doctoral Fellowships of Excellence Program at Bar-Ilan University, the Mordecai and Monique Katz Fellowship, the ISF grants 1083/13 and 1241/12 and the BSF grant 2012344.

Nerly Biton's comments on a preliminary version of this manuscript greatly improved its readability.

Many members of the math.stackexchange.com, mathoverflow.com and cs.stackexchange.com communities kindly helped in coping with specific issues arising in this paper. In particular, we are grateful to: Julin Aguirre, Christian Blatter, Ilya Bogdanov, Beni Bogosel, Boris Bukh, Anthony Carapetis, Scott Carnahan, Christopher Culter, Gabriel C. Drummond-Cole, David Eppstein, Yuval Filmus, Christopher Fish, Peter Franek, Nick Gill, John Gowers, Michael Greinecker, Dafin Guzman, Włodzimierz Holsztyński, Marcus Hum, Robert Israel, Barry Johnson, Joonas Ilmavirta, V. Kurchatkin, Jonathan Lubin, Raymond Manzoni, Ross Millikan, Lee Mosher, Rahul Narain, Sebastian Negraszus, Mariusz Nowak, Boris Novikov, Joseph O'Rourke, Emanuele Paolini, Raphael Reitzig, David Richerby, Andrs Salamon, Realz Slaw, B. Stoney, Eric Stucky, Steven Taschuk, Marc van Leeuwen, Martin van der Linden, Hagen von Eitzen, Martin von Gagern, Jared Warner, Frank W., Ittay Weiss, Willie Wong, Phoemue X and Amitai Yuval.

A. Geometric conditions for S-good knife functions

Recall Definition 3.7:

> Given a cake C and a family S, a knife function K_C is called *S-good* if for every absolutely-continuous value-measure V, both $V^S(K_C(t))$ and $V^S(\overline{K_C}(t))$ are continuous functions of t.

This section presents two different geometric properties of a knife function K_C, each of which guarantees that it is S-good.

A.1. S-smoothness

The first property is simple: both the region covered and the region not covered by the knife function should always return S-pieces whose Lebesgue measure changes continuously.

Definition A.1. Let S be a family of pieces. A knife function $K(t)$ is called *S-smooth* if:
(a) The Lebesgue measure of $K(t)$ (and hence of $\overline{K}(t)$) is a continuous function of t, and:
(b) for all t, both $K(t) \in S$ and $\overline{K}(t) \in S$.

Lemma A.2. *If V is a measure absolutely-continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure, and K is an S-smooth knife-function, then the real functions $V^S \circ K$ and $V^S \circ \overline{K}$ are continuous.*

Proof. The measure V is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure, and $Lebesgue(K(t))$ is a continuous function of t by condition (a). Hence, $V(K(t))$ is also a continuous function of t. Condition (b), namely $K(t) \in S$, implies that $\forall t \in [0,1] : V^S(K(t)) = V(K(t))$, so $V^S(K(t))$ is also a continuous function of t. An analogous proof applies to $V^S(\overline{K}(t))$. □

The knife function in Figure 5/a is Rectangle-smooth but not Square-smooth. The other knife functions in that figure are neither Rectangle-smooth nor Square-smooth (e.g in Figure 5/c, $\overline{K}(t)$ is not a rectangle).

We now prove a useful lemma that will help us find S-smooth functions. Recall that S-smoothness has two conditions: $Lebesgue(K(t))$ should be continuous, and $K(t)$ should be in S. We now focus on the first condition — continuity of $Lebesgue(K(t))$.

Given two bounded Borel subsets of $\mathbb{R}^d$, A and B, does there always exist a knife function K from A to B such that $Lebesgue(K(t))$ is continuous? By the monotonicity of a knife-function, a necessary condition is that $A \subset B$. By the following lemma, this condition is also sufficient.

Lemma A.3. *Let A and B be two bounded Borel subsets of $\mathbb{R}^d$ with $A \subseteq B$. There exists a knife function K from A to B, such that $Lebesgue(K(t))$ is a continuous function of t.*

Proof (based on Fish [20]). Pick a point $O \in B$. For every $r \geq 0$ let $D(r)$ be the open d-ball of radius r around O. Since B is bounded, there is a certain radius r_{max} such that $B \subseteq D(r_{max})$. For every $t \in [0,1]$, define $D^*(t) = D(t \cdot r_{max})$, so $D^*(t)$ is an open ball whose radius grows continuously from 0 to r_{max}. Define: $K(t) := [A \cup D^*(t)] \cap B$. Clearly, $K(0) = A$, $K(1) = B$ and K is (weakly) monotonically increasing. Hence, K is a knife-function from A to B. The continuity of $Lebesgue(K(t))$ follows from the fact that $Lebesgue(D^*(t))$ is continuous and for every Δt: $Lebesgue(K(t+\Delta t)) - Lebesgue(K(\Delta t)) \leq Lebesgue(D^*(t+\Delta t)) - Lebesgue(D^*(\Delta t))$. □

We call any function satisfying the requirements of Lemma A.3 a *knife-function with continuous Lebesgue-measure*. Any S-smooth knife-function has continuous Lebesgue-measure. Any knife-function with continuous Lebesgue-measure in which $K(t) \in S$ and $\overline{K}(t) \in S$ is S-smooth.

A.2. S-continuity

The second property is more involved. The knife function may return pieces that are not from S. However, it must change in a way that S-pieces are not created or destroyed abruptly, but rather grow or shrink in a continuous manner.

Definition A.4. A piece s is called a *ϵ-predecessor* of a piece s' if $s \subseteq s'$ and $Lebesgue(s' \setminus s) < \epsilon$.

Definition A.5. Let S be a family of pieces. A knife function $K(t)$ is called *S-continuous* if for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that, for all t and t' having $|t' - t| < \delta$:
(a) Every S-piece $s_{t'} \subseteq K(t')$ has an ϵ-predecessor S-piece $s_t \subseteq K(t)$.
(b) Every S-piece $s_{t'} \subseteq \overline{K}(t')$ has an ϵ-predecessor S-piece $s_t \subseteq \overline{K}(t)$.

Lemma A.6. *If V is a measure absolutely-continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure, and K is an S-continuous knife function, then the real functions $V^S \circ K$ and $V^S \circ \overline{K}$ are uniformly-continuous.*

Proof. Given $\epsilon' > 0$, we show the existence of $\delta > 0$ such that, for every t, t', if $|t' - t| < \delta$ then $|V^S(K(t')) - V^S(K(t))| < \epsilon'$.

Given ϵ', by the continuity of V, there is an $\epsilon > 0$ such that:

$$Lebesgue(s) < \epsilon \qquad \Longrightarrow \qquad V(s) < \epsilon' \tag{A.1}$$

Given that ϵ, by the S-continuity of K there is a $\delta > 0$ such that, if $|t' - t| < \delta$, then every S-piece $s_{t'} \subseteq K(t')$ has an ϵ-predecessor S-piece $s_t \subseteq K(t)$. This means that $s_t \subseteq s_{t'}$ and:

$$Lebesgue(s_{t'} \setminus s_t) < \epsilon$$

which by (A.1) implies

$$V(s_{t'} \setminus s_t) < \epsilon'$$

which by additivity of V implies

$$V(s_t) > V(s_{t'}) - \epsilon'$$

The latter inequality is true for every S-piece $s_{t'} \subseteq K(t')$, so it is also true for the supremum:

$$\sup_{s_t \in S, s_t \subseteq K(t)} V(s_t) \geq V(s_t) > \sup_{s_{t'} \in S, s_{t'} \subseteq K(t')} V(s_{t'}) - \epsilon'$$

By definition, the S-value is the supremum, so:

$$V^S(K(t)) > V^S(K(t')) - \epsilon'$$

By symmetric arguments (replacing the roles of t and t'), $V^S(K(t')) > V^S(K(t)) - \epsilon'$. Hence $|V^S(K(t')) - V^S(K(t))| < \epsilon'$ as we wanted to prove.

An analogous proof applies to the function $V^S \circ \overline{K}$. □

The following lemma demonstrates how the existence of S-continuous functions can be proved.

Lemma A.7. *Let S be the family of d-dimensional cubes. For every bounded cake C in $\mathbb{R}^d$, there exists an S-continuous knife-function from $\emptyset$ to C.*



Figure A.13: Square-continuity of the knife-function defined in Lemma A.7.
The solid line describes the knife location at time t; the dotted line describes its location at time $t + \delta$.
The dotted squares are squares contained in $H(t + \delta)$; the solid squares are their predecessors in $H(t)$.
At the bottom, the side-length of the solid square is smaller than the dotted square by exactly δ.
At the top, the side-length of the solid square is smaller than the dotted square by less than δ.

Proof. Since C is bounded, it can be moved and scaled such that it is contained in the unit cube $[0,1]^d$. For every $t \in [0,1]$, Let $H(t)$ be the half-space defined by: $x < t$. Define: $K_C(t) := H(t) \cap C$. Clearly, $K_C(0) = \emptyset$, $K_C(1) = C$ and K_C is (weakly) monotonically increasing. Hence, K_C is a knife-function from $\emptyset$ to C.

The proof that K_C is S-continuous is based on the following geometric fact: for every cube $s_{t'}$ contained in the half-space $H(t + \delta)$, there exists a cube $s_t \subseteq s_{t'}$ contained in the half-space $H(t)$, such that the side-length of s_t is smaller than that of $s_{t'}$ by at most δ (it is smaller by exactly δ when $s_{t'}$ is adjacent to the rightmost side of $H(t+\delta)$ and parallel to the axes; see Figure A.13 for an illustration of the two-dimensional case). Suppose $s_{t'}$ is also contained in C. Since C is contained in the unit cube, the side-length of $s_{t'}$ is at most 1. Therefore, the area of s_t is smaller than that of $s_{t'}$ by at most $1 - (1 - \delta)^d \leq d \cdot \delta$.

Consider now the definition of S-continuity. For every $\epsilon > 0$, take $\delta := \epsilon/d$, let $t' = t + \delta$ and let $s_{t'}$ be an S-piece contained in $K_C(t')$. By definition of K_C, $s_{t'}$ is contained in both C and $H(t')$. By the geometric fact, $s_{t'}$ has an ϵ-predecessor s_t that is contained in $H(t)$. Since $s_t \subseteq s_{t'}$, it is also contained in C. Hence, it is contained in $K_C(t)$. □

Using similar arguments, it is possible to prove that the function K_C described above is S-continuous also when S is the family of boxes or fat boxes. Full characterization of the the families S for which K_C is S-continuous is an interesting question that is beyond the scope of the present paper.

A.3. Examples

The knife-function in Figure 5/a, $K_C(t) = [0, L] \times [0, t]$, is a special case of the 'sweeping plane' function of Lemma A.7. Hence it is square-continuous (and also rectangle-continuous).

As a negative example, consider the knife function $K_C(t) = [0, t] \times [0, 1] \cup [1 - t, 1] \times [0, 1]$ defined on the cake $C = [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$. This function describes two rectangles that approach each other from two opposite sides of the cake (see Figure A.14). It is not square-continuous. Intuitively, a square of side-length 1 is created at time $t = 0.5$, when the two components of $K_C(t)$ meet. Formally, let $\epsilon = 0.75$. For every $\delta > 0$, select $t = 0.5 - \frac{\delta}{3}$ and $t' = 0.5 + \frac{\delta}{3}$. Then $K_C(t')$ contains

(c),(d) $K_3(t)$



Figure A.14: A knife-function that is not S-continuous.

the square $s' = [0,1] \times [0,1]$, but all squares $s \subseteq K_C(t)$ have a side-length of less than 0.5, hence $Lebesgue(s' \setminus s) > 0.75 = \epsilon$.

The knife-functions in Figure 5/b,c,d,e are S-continuous but not S-smooth. Thus one may think that S-continuity is more permissive than S-smoothness. But this is not the case: S-continuity and S-smoothness are two independent properties. To see this, let S' be the family of *rectangle-pairs* (defined as unions of two rectangles). The function K_C defined in the previous paragraph (and Figure A.14) is S'-smooth, because both $K_C(t)$ and $\overline{K_C}(t)$ are rectangle-pairs. However, K_C is not S'-continuous because some rectangle-pairs (e.g. $[0,1] \times [0,0.2] \cup [0,1] \times [0.8,1]$) are created abruptly at time $t = 0.5$.

A.4. Conclusion

We proved two independent sufficient conditions for S-goodness. Combining Lemmas A.2 and A.6 gives:

Corollary A.8. *If a knife-function is either S-smooth or S-continuous (or both), then it is S-good.*

Each of the two conditions, S-smoothness and S-continuity, is sufficient but not necessary for S-goodness.

B. Upper bounds on proportionality

To complement the positive results presented in Section 4, we present here some negative results — upper bounds on the attainable proportionality level.

The following generic technique is used in all impossibility results. Assume that C is a desert with M water-pools. Consider two agents whose value measure is proportional to the amount of water in their land-plot. Suppose it is possible to give each agent an S-piece containing a single water pool, but impossible to give both agents more than one pool since there is room for at most a single S-piece touching two pools. Therefore, at least one agent has at most one pool and a utility of at most $1/M$. The arrangements of pools and the corresponding upper bounds are presented in Figure B.15.

C. Convex version of Subsection 4.4

The following theorem is a variant of Theorem 1(c) in which the cake must be convex and the pieces are guaranteed to be convex. The convexity requirement, while seemingly simple, implies that we cannot use the usual knife functions anymore. For example, if C is a circle then every knife function (which must be a straight line to keep the pieces convex) must start with an infinitely slim piece. Hence we must use another technique which can be called a *rotating-knife*.



Figure B.15: Impossibility results (upper bounds) on proportionality. At least one agent receives at most one pool.



Figure C.16: Convex variant of Figure 8. A convex R-fat cake (the ellipse) is divided by a rotating knife (dotted line) to two 2R-fat convex pieces.

Theorem. *For every $R \geq 1$, If C is an R-fat 2-dimensional convex figure and S is the family of convex $2R$-fat pieces then:*

$$PropEF(C, S, 2) = 1/2$$

Proof. Scale, rotate and translate the cake C such that the largest square contained in C is $B^- = [-1, 1] \times [-1, 1]$. By definition of fatness, C is now contained in a square B^+ of side-length at most $2R$.

Consider a line passing through the origin at angle $\theta \in [0°, 360°]$ from the x axis (see Figure C.16). This line cuts the contained square B^- into two quadrangles, each of which contains a square with side-length 1. Because C is convex, this line also cuts the boundary of C at exactly two points, splitting C to two convex pieces. Each of these two pieces is $2R$-fat since it contains a square with side-length 1 and it is contained in B^+ whose side-length is $2R$.

Let $W(\theta)$ be the value of the piece for agent #1 at the left-hand side of the line when facing at angle θ. Because the value measure is continuous, W is continuous. When θ rotates by 180°, the piece that was at the left-hand side is now at the right-hand side and vice versa (e.g. when $\theta = 0°$ the left-hand side is above the line and when $\theta = 180°$ the right-hand side is above the line). Hence if $W(\theta) > 1/2$ then $W(180° + \theta) = 1 - W(\theta) < 1/2$ and vice versa. Hence by the continuity of W there must be a θ for which $W(\theta) = 1/2$. Cut the cake at the line in angle θ. Let agent #2 choose a piece and give the other piece to agent #1. Now both agents have a piece which is convex and $2R$-fat and their value is at least $1/2$. □

So far we have not managed to generalize the rotating-knife technique to more than two agents.

References

References

[1] P. K. Agarwal, M. J. Katz, M. Sharir, Computing depth orders for fat objects and related problems, Computational Geometry 5 (4) (1995) 187–206, ISSN 09257721, doi:10.1016/0925-7721(95)00005-8, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0925-7721(95)00005-8.

[2] H. Aziz, S. Mackenzie, A Discrete and Bounded Envy-Free Cake Cutting Protocol for Any Number of Agents, in: FOCS 2016, URL http://arxiv.org/abs/1604.03655, 2016.

[3] Y. Azrieli, E. Shmaya, Rental harmony with roommates, Journal of Economic Theory 153 (2014) 128–137, ISSN 00220531, doi:10.1016/j.jet.2014.06.006, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jet.2014.06.006.

[4] J. B. Barbanel, S. J. Brams, Cake division with minimal cuts: envy-free procedures for three persons, four persons, and beyond, Mathematical Social Sciences 48 (3) (2004) 251–269, ISSN 01654896, doi:10.1016/j.mathsocsci.2004.03.006, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mathsocsci.2004.03.006.

[5] J. B. Barbanel, S. J. Brams, W. Stromquist, Cutting a pie is not a piece of cake, American Mathematical Monthly 116 (6) (2009) 496–514, doi:10.4169/193009709X470407, URL http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/12772/1/Pie-Cutting_rev_.pdf.

[6] A. Beck, Constructing a Fair Border, The American Mathematical Monthly 94 (2) (1987) 157–162, ISSN 00029890, doi:10.2307/2322417, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2322417.

[7] M. Berliant, K. Dunz, A foundation of location theory: existence of equilibrium, the welfare theorems, and core, Journal of Mathematical Economics 40 (5) (2004) 593–618, ISSN 03044068, doi:10.1016/s0304-4068(03)00077-6, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s0304-4068(03)00077-6.

[8] M. Berliant, T. Raa, A foundation of location theory: Consumer preferences and demand, Journal of Economic Theory 44 (2) (1988) 336–353, ISSN 00220531, doi:10.1016/0022-0531(88)90008-7, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0022-0531(88)90008-7.

[9] M. Berliant, W. Thomson, K. Dunz, On the fair division of a heterogeneous commodity, Journal of Mathematical Economics 21 (3) (1992) 201–216, ISSN 03044068, doi:10.1016/0304-4068(92)90001-n, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0304-4068(92)90001-n.

[10] S. J. Brams, M. Jones, C. Klamler, Proportional pie-cutting, International Journal of Game Theory 36 (3-4) (2008) 353–367, doi:10.1007/s00182-007-0108-z, URL http://www.nyu.edu/gsas/dept/politics/faculty/brams/prop_pie.pdf.

[11] S. J. Brams, A. D. Taylor, An Envy-Free Cake Division Protocol, The American Mathematical Monthly 102 (1) (1995) 9+, ISSN 00029890, doi:10.2307/2974850, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2974850.

[12] S. J. Brams, A. D. Taylor, W. S. Zwicker, A Moving-Knife Solution to the Four-Person Envy-Free Cake Division Problem, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society 125 (2) (1997) 547–554, URL http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.104.3390.

[13] I. Caragiannis, J. K. Lai, A. D. Procaccia, Towards more expressive cake cutting, in: Proceedings of the 22nd International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI-11), AAAI Press, ISBN 978-1-57735-513-7, 127–132, doi:10.5591/978-1-57735-516-8/ijcai11-033, URL http://www.cs.cmu.edu/~./arielpro/papers/nonadd.ijcai11.pdf, 2011.

[14] C. P. Chambers, Allocation rules for land division, Journal of Economic Theory 121 (2) (2005) 236–258, ISSN 00220531, doi:10.1016/j.jet.2004.04.008, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jet.2004.04.008.

[15] Y. Chen, J. K. Lai, D. C. Parkes, A. D. Procaccia, Truth, justice, and cake cutting, Games and Economic Behavior 77 (1) (2013) 284–297, ISSN 08998256, doi:10.1016/j.geb.2012.10.009, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.geb.2012.10.009.

[16] Y. J. Cohler, J. K. Lai, D. C. Parkes, A. D. Procaccia, Optimal Envy-Free Cake Cutting, in: Proceedings of the 25th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-11), 626–631, URL http://www.aaai.org/ocs/index.php/AAAI/AAAI11/paper/download/3638/3938, 2011.

[17] M. Dall'Aglio, F. Maccheroni, Disputed lands, Games and Economic Behavior 66 (1) (2009) 57–77, ISSN 08998256, doi:10.1016/j.geb.2008.04.006, URL http://eprints.luiss.it/727/1/Dall'Aglio_no.58_2007.pdf.

[18] X. Deng, Q. Qi, A. Saberi, Algorithmic Solutions for Envy-Free Cake Cutting, Operations Research 60 (6) (2012) 1461–1476, ISSN 1526-5463, doi:10.1287/opre.1120.1116, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/opre.1120.1116.

[19] L. E. Dubins, E. H. Spanier, How to Cut A Cake Fairly, The American Mathematical Monthly 68 (1) (1961) 1+, ISSN 00029890, doi:10.2307/2311357, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2311357.

[20] C. Fish, A continuous path between shapes, Mathematics Stack Exchange, URL http://math.stackexchange.com/a/1015267/29780, uRL:http://math.stackexchange.com/a/1015267/29780, 2014.

[21] T. P. Hill, Determining a Fair Border, The American Mathematical Monthly 90 (7) (1983) 438–442, ISSN 00029890, doi:10.2307/2975720, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2975720.

[22] F. Hüsseinov, A theory of a heterogeneous divisible commodity exchange economy, Journal of Mathematical Economics 47 (1) (2011) 54–59, ISSN 03044068, doi:10.1016/j.jmateco.2010.12.001, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jmateco.2010.12.001.

[23] F. Hüsseinov, N. Sagara, Existence of efficient envy-free allocations of a heterogeneous divisible commodity with nonadditive utilities, Social Choice and Welfare (2013) 1–18doi:10.1007/s00355-012-0714-y, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00355-012-0714-y.

[24] T. Ichiishi, A. Idzik, Equitable allocation of divisible goods, Journal of Mathematical Economics 32 (4) (1999) 389–400, ISSN 03044068, doi:10.1016/s0304-4068(98)00053-6, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s0304-4068(98)00053-6.

[25] K. Iyer, M. N. Huhns, A Procedure for the Allocation of Two-Dimensional Resources in a Multiagent System, International Journal of Cooperative Information Systems 18 (2009) 1–34, doi:10.1142/S0218843009002051, URL http://www.worldscientific.com/doi/abs/10.1142/S0218843009002051.

[26] M. J. Katz, 3-D vertical ray shooting and 2-D point enclosure, range searching, and arc shooting amidst convex fat objects, Computational Geometry 8 (6) (1997) 299–316, ISSN 09257721, doi:10.1016/s0925-7721(96)00027-2, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s0925-7721(96)00027-2.

[27] D. Kurokawa, J. K. Lai, A. D. Procaccia, How to Cut a Cake Before the Party Ends, in: Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, 555–561, URL http://www.cs.cmu.edu/~arielpro/papers/unicake.full.pdf, 2013.

[28] J. Legut, J. A. M. Potters, S. H. Tijs, Economies with Land - A Game Theoretical Approach, Games and Economic Behavior 6 (3) (1994) 416–430, ISSN 08998256, doi:10.1006/game.1994.1024, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/game.1994.1024.

[29] M. LiCalzi, A. Nicolò, Efficient egalitarian equivalent allocations over a single good, Economic Theory 40 (1) (2009) 27–45, doi:10.1007/s00199-008-0361-9, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00199-008-0361-9.

[30] F. Maccheroni, M. Marinacci, How to cut a pizza fairly: Fair division with decreasing marginal evaluations, Social Choice and Welfare 20 (3) (2003) 457–465, doi:10.1007/s003550200192, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s003550200192.

[31] Y. Manabe, T. Okamoto, Meta-Envy-Free Cake-Cutting Protocols, in: P. Hliněný, A. Kučera (Eds.), Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science 2010, vol. 6281

of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, chap. 44, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, ISBN 978-3-642-15154-5, 501–512, doi:10.1007/978-3-642-15155-2_44, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-15155-2_44, 2010.

[32] R. S. Mirchandani, Superadditivity and Subadditivity in Fair Division, Journal of Mathematics Research 5 (3) (2013) 78–91, ISSN 1916-9809, doi:10.5539/jmr.v5n3p78, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/jmr.v5n3p78.

[33] A. Nicolò, Perea, P. Roberti, Equal opportunity equivalence in land division, SERIEs - Journal of the Spanish Economic Association 3 (1-2) (2012) 133–142, doi:10.1007/s13209-011-0069-0, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s13209-011-0069-0.

[34] A. Nicolò, Y. Yu, Strategic divide and choose, Games and Economic Behavior 64 (1) (2008) 268–289, ISSN 08998256, doi:10.1016/j.geb.2008.01.006, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.geb.2008.01.006.

[35] A. D. Procaccia, Cake Cutting Algorithms, in: F. Brandt, V. Conitzer, U. Endriss, J. Lang, A. D. Procaccia (Eds.), Handbook of Computational Social Choice, chap. 13, Cambridge University Press, URL http://www.cs.cmu.edu/~arielpro/papers/cakechapter.pdf, 2015.

[36] J. H. Reijnierse, J. A. M. Potters, On finding an envy-free Pareto-optimal division, Mathematical Programming 83 (1-3) (1998) 291–311, doi:10.1007/bf02680564, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/bf02680564.

[37] J. M. Robertson, W. A. Webb, Cake-Cutting Algorithms: Be Fair if You Can, A K Peters/CRC Press, first edn., ISBN 1568810768, URL http://www.worldcat.org/isbn/1568810768, 1998.

[38] A. Saberi, Y. Wang, Cutting a Cake for Five People, in: A. V. Goldberg, Y. Zhou (Eds.), Algorithmic Aspects in Information and Management, vol. 5564 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 292–300, doi:10.1007/978-3-642-02158-9_25, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-02158-9_25, 2009.

[39] N. Sagara, M. Vlach, Equity and Efficiency in a Measure Space with Nonadditive Preferences: The Problem of Cake Division, Journal of Economic Literature 90 (2005) 1, URL http://web.econ.keio.ac.jp/staff/maruyama/rcme/seminar/abst050523.pdf.

[40] E. Segal-Halevi, A. Hassidim, Y. Aumann, Envy-Free Cake-Cutting in Two Dimensions, in: Proceedings of the 29th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-15), 1021–1028, URL http://www.aaai.org/ocs/index.php/AAAI/AAAI15/paper/view/9656, 2015.

[41] E. Segal-Halevi, S. Nitzan, A. Hassidim, Y. Aumann, Fair and Square: Cake-Cutting in Two Dimensions, URL http://arxiv.org/abs/1510.03170, arXiv preprint 1510.03170, 2015.

[42] H. Steinhaus, The problem of fair division, Econometrica 16 (1) (1948) 101–104, URL http://www.jstor.org/stable/1914289.

[43] W. Stromquist, How to Cut a Cake Fairly, The American Mathematical Monthly 87 (8) (1980) 640–644, ISSN 00029890, doi:10.2307/2320951, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2320951.

[44] W. Stromquist, Envy-free cake divisions cannot be found by finite protocols, Electronic Journal of Combinatorics URL http://www.emis.ams.org/journals/EJC/Volume_15/PDF/v15i1r11.pdf.

[45] F. E. Su, Rental Harmony: Sperner's Lemma in Fair Division, The American Mathematical Monthly 106 (10) (1999) 930–942, ISSN 00029890, doi:10.2307/2589747, URL http://www.math.hmc.edu/~su/papers.dir/rent.pdf.

[46] W. Thomson, Children Crying at Birthday Parties. Why?, Economic Theory 31 (3) (2007) 501–521, ISSN 0938-2259, doi:10.1007/s00199-006-0109-3, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00199-006-0109-3.

[47] W. A. Webb, A Combinatorial Algorithm to Establish a Fair Border, European Journal of Combinatorics 11 (3) (1990) 301–304, ISSN 01956698, doi:10.1016/s0195-6698(13)80129-1, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s0195-6698(13)80129-1.

[48] D. Weller, Fair division of a measurable space, Journal of Mathematical Economics 14 (1) (1985) 5–17, ISSN 03044068, doi:10.1016/0304-4068(85)90023-0, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0304-4068(85)90023-0.

This figure "negative-result-nonconvex-fat-shapes.png" is available in "png" format

http://arxiv.org/ps/1609.03938v1